

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> XXXIX. APRIL 1885.

---

ART. I.—THE LITERARY HISTORY OF  
ENGLAND.

*The Literary History of England in the End of the Eighteenth  
and Beginning of the Nineteenth Century.* By MRS.  
OLIPHANT. Three vols. (London, 1882.)

REFERENCE was made in an article of our last number to Mrs. Oliphant's *Historical Sketches*, which had gone through three editions in 1875, and must therefore have secured a fair amount of public appreciation. They dealt with twelve prominent figures in the life of England during the eighteenth century—Caroline as 'the Queen,' Walpole as 'the Minister,' Chesterfield as 'the Man of the World,' Lady Mary Wortley Montagu as 'the Woman of Fashion,' Pope as 'the Poet,' Charles Edward<sup>1</sup> as 'the Young Chevalier,' John Wesley as 'the Reformer,' Anson as 'the Sailor,' Bishop Berkeley as 'the Philosopher,' Richardson as 'the Novelist,' Hume as 'the Sceptic,' Hogarth as 'the Painter.' The chief complaint to be made against a book which is distinctly worthy of a place among 'books to be kept within reach' is this, that one illustrious name, at once venerable and beloved, is there conspicuous by absence. Why was there no room found for a great, a very great, Englishman, who was born six years after Wesley and died seven years before him—for Samuel Johnson as 'the Moralist'? Could a portrait-gallery of such a period be complete without *him*, whom the *Times* of December 13, 1884, the centenary of his death, described as 'perhaps the greatest man of letters whom England has yet produced, one of the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Ewald, in his recent and full biography of this unhappy prince, remarks that he never called himself 'Charles Edward,' but always 'Charles.'—*Life and Times of Prince Charles Stuart*, p. 5.

VOL. XX.—NO. XXXIX.

B

370623

noblest spirits which ever animated a human frame ;' whom the *Fortnightly Review* for the same month, while disparaging his writings, even his *Lives of the Poets*, characterized as 'the unequalled talker, the sweet and formidable friend, the truculent boon companion, the childlike Christian ;' while another writer in the *Contemporary Review* for last January treated Johnson's life as a triumphant record of victory in the struggle with manifold afflictions, and at the same time redressed the balance by dwelling gratefully on the helpfulness of his books ? We cannot conceive how Mrs. Oliphant could have written down the sweeping generalization that in an age which had 'fallen out of thought of God . . . the good men were in-operative,'<sup>1</sup> and never thought of the witness borne for religion by the great literary potentate whom her series so unaccountably omits. The omission is the more regrettable, as being one which the plan of her later work would not suffer it to repair. She does indeed allude to Johnson as the central personage of an interregnum between the 'Augustan age' of English literature and that later Georgian period which is the subject of the volumes before us.

'He had given much,' she says, 'to his generation—a rugged uprightness and scorn for all meaner arts, a noble spirit which would not brook the servility to which life and nature had been so long bound ; but in return he tyrannized over it, and permitted no voice to be heard in his presence, objecting in others to the independence which was his own great title to the respect and admiration of his time' (i. 12).

This statement is a good deal too absolute ; but, noting it as such, we pass on to the description of our authoress's object as being, in her own words, 'to give, as fully as she was able, a history of the new departures, in poetry above all, in criticism, in fiction, and, to the extent of her ability, to indicate those which have occurred in history and philosophy,' during the latter years of the eighteenth century and the first thirty years or so of the nineteenth. She admits that 'her story will be found to overlap the boundaries on both sides, now going too far back, now reaching too far forward.' This, she pleads, is unavoidable : but is it Scottish patriotism which leads our authoress, when professing to start from the end of the eighteenth century, to insert a chapter on 'Literature in Scotland before Burns,' wherein a writer figures who published poems in the Culloden year—that is, four years before the

<sup>1</sup> *Historical Sketches*, p. 249.



commencement of the *Rambler*, and thirty-two years before that of the *Lives of the Poets*?

We proceed to give our readers some specimens of the *Literary History*, selecting for the most part such topics as come best within the scope of a Church review. The first chapter is devoted to Cowper; and Mrs. Oliphant brings out one point in his strange and mournful story which we never before saw emphasized. It is, in fact, the lesson of his life, as she reads it: that 'mental enervation' and habits of self-indulgent indolence laid him open to the attacks of that 'mysterious and terrible' malady which not only darkened his whole being at intervals, but cast around his death-bed the semblance of 'unutterable despair.' Up to the age of thirty,

'Cowper had trained himself to incapacity, as other men do to work. He had let everything go from him; nothing in the world, not love itself, not independence, far less ambition, were worth to him the effort of seizing them' (i. 31).

When, perforce, 'he began to study the work that would be required of him' as a clerk to the House of Lords, with the dreaded prospect of 'an examination at the bar of the House'—a prospect which darkened into 'one fixed horror'—frenzy gradually set in, and wrought him up to attempts at suicide. Having 'lived the life of a careless egotist for years, he was quite defenceless when the strain came.' The peculiar form of religion which coloured his insanity disposed its adherents to intense self-introspection, which even in healthier natures might easily become morbid, and might at any rate obscure the consciousness of that all-considerate equity which is involved in the fact of a Divine and perfect Fatherhood. Mrs. Oliphant criticizes Mr. Goldwin Smith's explanation of Cowper's recovery under a good physician's roof as 'having been brought about . . . by medical treatment wisely applied,' although 'it came in the form of a burst of religious faith and hope.'

'At the best,' she says, 'it is but a conjecture that religious faith and hope can be produced by a regulation of the digestive organs. However, by whatsoever means attained, in all probability by many means acting together, by calm and the absence of causes of external irritation, by the wearing out of the paroxysm of insane delusion, by the soothing influences of religious intercourse, and by that inexplicable power which nobody may understand, but which it is impossible to ignore, called grace, conversion, light from heaven, by the associates whom Cowper now chiefly prized, and only very lamely and vaguely accounted for by the philosophers as a reformed digestion—the sick man got well. He did more than get well; a

tremulous and exquisite happiness took the place of his anguish and despair' (i. 45).

Unhappily it was but for a while. Another access of insanity came upon him in 1771, according to Mrs. Oliphant—in 1773, according to Mr. Dale—at any rate while he was at Olney, under the elder-sisterly care of Mrs. Unwin. Years afterwards, as Mrs. Unwin's strength decayed, anxiety and anticipation of her death recalled Cowper's old misery in its worst form. He who had once poured out a heart full of faith and gratitude in one of the sweetest of all English hymns, 'Hark, my soul, it is the Lord,' who had put into four simple lines the text which assures us that a mother's love itself is no match for the love of the Eternal—

'Can a woman's tender care  
Cease toward the child she bare?  
Yes, she may forgetful be,  
Yet will I remember thee'—

this man lived to tell Lady Hesketh in the February of 1796 that his Creator repented of having made him, and that he was going down, doomed, 'into the gulf;' and, later still, to emphasize this fearful surrender of a Christian's hope in the concluding stanza of his *Castaway*:—

'No voice Divine the storm allayed,  
No light propitious shone,  
When, snatched from all effectual aid,  
We perished, each alone;  
But I beneath a rougher sea,  
And whelmed in deeper gulfs than he.'

It is one of the most overawing instances of a mystery in God's treatment of His children that a life so gentle, so pious, and so sad, should have been suffered to close amid such blackness of darkness. Johnson's fear of death passed away before 'the inevitable hour:' Cowper died imagining himself reprobate. Mrs. Oliphant feels the deep tragedy of the situation, but points on to the issue which faith makes real to us.

'The last words he said were, when he was offered a cordial, "What can it signify?" What, indeed, did it matter, an hour of weakness more or less, a pain the greater? By that time the gloom had reached its blackest, the light was near. What did it signify? Who can doubt that all the ceaseless sufferings of his life, all his miseries, some hours thereafter had become as dreams to him in the great and new revelation which awaited him at the gates of heaven?'

Her words cannot but remind us of that touching and consolatory poem which Mrs. Browning wrote after visiting Cowper's grave; from which we may be allowed to quote, perhaps, the most touching and consolatory portion. The reader will see how it fits in with Cowper's hymn already cited.

'Like a sick child that knoweth not his mother when she blesses,  
And drops upon his burning brow the coolness of her kisses;  
That turns his fevered eyes around—"My mother! where's my  
mother?"

As if such tender words and looks could come from any other!  
The fever gone, with leaps of heart he sees her bending o'er him,  
Her face all pale from watchful love, the unwearied love she bore him:  
Thus woke the poet from the dream his life's long fever gave him,  
Beneath those deep pathetic Eyes, which closed in death to save  
him!

Thus? O not thus! no type of earth could image that awaking,  
Wherein he scarcely heard the chant of seraphs round him breaking,  
Or felt the new immortal throb of soul from body parted,  
But felt those Eyes alone, and knew, "My Saviour! *not* deserted!"

Cowper's place as a poet is determined, says Mrs. Oliphant, not by his earlier compositions in rhyming heroic verse, which she estimates (rather too trenchantly) as made up of 'respectable platitudes,' and which conform to the type, or submit to the yoke, of the earlier poetical school, but by the *Task*, representing as it does a sudden and inexplicable rush into the new freedom and energetic life, the 'discursiveness,' the 'unvarnished nature and truth,' of 'poetry genuine, original, and often great,' whereby 'he broke the spell of Pope,' and emancipated his age, as well as himself, from all servile bonds. He had not, like Wordsworth, a scheme of poetic revolution, but, like Wordsworth, he threw aside conventions, and gave to his readers a series of pictures in which every feature had its distinct and delicate reality; in which also, we must add, still following Mrs. Oliphant, there was 'no wilful descent from the worthy to the mean, as in the case of' some Wordsworthian trivialities, which one would willingly forget to be Wordsworth's. The main charm of the *Task* for affectionate and home-loving readers is its glorification of the evening fireside; but the various scenes of outdoor country life—the aspects of a wintry or vernal landscape, the work in garden or in greenhouse, the woodman with his dog, the snow-clad fields, the ice-bound stream, 'the thresher at his task,' the postman 'dropping the expected bag'—are set before us with a vivid realism which that age must have wondered at while

it was learning to welcome and enjoy. Of course there are large masses of reflection, not unmingled with censure, on the pursuits and amusements of the world that stretched outside the poet's seclusion; censure which Mrs. Oliphant regards as excessive and ungenerous, and as 'a great drawback in point of art.' We have not time to dwell on the ample variety of subjects for which the *Task* finds room. The over-severity of the penal code, the disregard of Sunday in towns, military dandies, disorderly undergraduates, absentee landlords, daring burglars, constitutional as opposed to despotic kingship, the claims of animals to kindly treatment—such themes as these are combined with pictures of nature, and with earnest utterances of devout faith, into one miscellaneous and curiously attractive whole. It may be added that the student of Cowper will not derive a very favourable impression of the clergy of his day; but the oft-recurring strictures dispose one to ask what amount of evidence on that subject was present to a recluse whose life as an author was spent at three places in Huntingdonshire, amid a narrow circle of intimates. Every one, we presume, would make some deductions from Cowper's judgment on classes and institutions, on the schools of the time, and generally on all non-rural life. The 'stricken deer' could hardly bear witness as to the herd.

Mrs. Oliphant dwells on the contrast between Cowper and Burns; 'nevertheless,' she adds, 'their work had a similar influence. The one in his blue bonnet, the other in his invalid nightcap, they stand at the great gates which had been neatly barred and bolted by the last generation, and, pushing them back upon their unwilling hinges, made English poetry free as she had been before.' She traces the career of the great peasant poet with recurring thoughts of his elder English contemporary.

'His mission, like that of Cowper's, was more to reveal than to invent. . . . He was as little afraid of the homeliest facts of his landscape as Cowper was; . . . but the principle which Cowper applied only to the external country Burns employed for the inner man. . . . And Burns was so much the greater poet . . . that his advent was far more startling and effective than that of his gentler fellow. . . . They were both equally withdrawn, though in ways so different, from the excitements and emulations of literary coteries, . . . were equal rebels to the world and all its conventional ways' (i. 113).

Further on two interesting quotations show us that the two poets appreciated each other's writings, and Burns even carried the *Task* in his pocket. Burns, it is added, even surpassed Cowper in his tender sympathy for animals. Two stanzas

indicating how, on a windy night, the young Ayrshire ploughman lay thinking of the creatures outside, exposed to the rough weather, suggest the remark—

'Cowper was the gentlest of men, making pets even of hares, and turning with loathing from him who would crush a worm; but it is not to *his* sensitive spirit that the darkness opens, and the silly sheep and the helpless birds show themselves in the dreary midnight, unfortunate brothers for whom his heart bleeds' (i. 119).

The 'downward career' of Burns is all too dismal a subject. It began, our authoress points out, when he gained his 'first social elevation' by being admitted into a certain 'jovial coterie' at Mauchline. It was precipitated by his second visit to Edinburgh in 1787-8, when, in default of the higher society which was opened to him in his first, he fell back on men of coarse taste and low tone, who were only too ready to be his boon companions. But 'no man,' says Mrs. Oliphant—and it is a weighty ethical maxim—'no man is led away *whose will is against going*.' The difficulties of an ambiguous position, intensified by what he himself called the 'rebellious pride and agonizing sensibility' which, in a nature that never acquired self-control, were apt on the least provocation to start up in defiance, and disgust or grieve well-meaning friends, had doubtless much to do with a 'decline and fall' such as few men so richly gifted have left for a warning to posterity. Principal Shairp<sup>1</sup> has told the unspeakably sad story of those last months and days at Dumfries. Mrs. Oliphant passes it over briefly, and recurs to her parallelism of Burns and Cowper as fellow-workers in the permanent enfranchisement of poetry. Neither of them, she says, 'knew how to rule his own spirit; but Cowper had the excuse of mental disease, whereas no apology can be made for Burns except that which pity makes for the victim of a defective will in all circumstances.'

The chapter on Crabbe is an interesting exposition of his 'mission' as a 'completion' of the work of Cowper and Burns. Cowper had taken England 'back to the spontaneity and ease of nature,' and Burns had 'brought out the very sweetness of the natural heart. . . . These were the apostles of an equality. . . . which bound together the highest and the lowest, not by casting down one or raising up another, but by revealing each to each where each was most real.' Crabbe had 'to prove the Arcadian fields to be regions of labour, hard and bitter as any on earth;' to 'overthrow the last

<sup>1</sup> 'Burns,' in *English Men of Letters*, ch. vii.

delusion,' the last bit of 'artificial sentiment,' the fond idealism of 'peasant felicity.' In less than two lines he summarizes his resolution to strike at the root of those pretty conventionalities, to have done with Corydon and Tityrus, and make men look hard at 'the *real* picture of the poor.'

'I paint the cot,  
As truth will paint it, and as bards will not.'

The *Village*, which opens with this uncompromising announcement, was published in 1783, a year before the readers of the *Task* were shown how hard life was in 'the peasant's nest,' that at first had seemed so attractive. But there was yet a harsher lesson for benevolent sentimentalists. Boswell reports that Johnson approved 'Mr. Crabbe's' exposure of 'the false notions of rustic happiness and rustic *virtue*;' <sup>1</sup> it would serve, he might say, to 'clear the mind' of so much 'cant.' The *Parish Register* carries on the same theme: ugly facts must be confronted:

'The true physician walks the foulest ward.'

The third part of this poem, on 'Burials,' is for the most part not only sombre, but disheartening. We know not why Mrs. Oliphant passes over the *Borough* and the *Tales*, which, apart from occasional manifestations of truest tragic power, are signally rich in knowledge of human nature, and especially of the involutions of self-deceit, as well as in the sweet sly humour which endeared this poet so much to Walter Scott, who, as our readers may recollect, after hearing a chapter of the 'One Rook' read to him on his death-bed, asked in the next place for 'a bit of Crabbe.' Those who have to guide souls—yes, and those who have had reason to mistrust their own self-guidance—would do well to study the fourteenth *Tale*, on the 'Struggles of Conscience;' the seventeenth letter in the *Borough*, on what Butler calls 'compositions' with duty; or the nineteenth, on 'reasoning with temptation.' The gradual lapse of a sceptic from his non-religious morality into a necessarianism which encouraged him to 'obey each passion's call, and use his reason to defend them all,' is wonderfully depicted in the eleventh *Tale*; and the inefficacy of mere feeling as a support of faith and a token of moral soundness is urged on us in the nineteenth, which might furnish a motto for the ninth of Newman's *Parochial Sermons*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, ed. Napier, iii. 286.

<sup>2</sup> There is a fine illustration of Rom. i. 32 in *Borough*, xiv.; and the end of *Borough*, x., anticipates the *Christian Year* for the 24th Sunday after Trinity.

A  
unbe  
again  
farm  
it w  
totyp

Crab  
was  
The  
true  
what  
Boro  
Rom  
sarca  
who  
insta

Ther  
calle  
expe

1  
2  
3

Meth  
which



Alike from the *Tales* and from the *Borough* we learn that unbelief in Crabbe's time was fluent, insolent, and bitter against priestcraft, among townsfolk and villagers, gentlemen farmers, attorneys, and office clerks;<sup>1</sup> and agnostics who think it well to frequent public worship have in some sort a prototype in the 'Dr. Campbell' who could say—

'A man may smile, but still he should attend  
His hour at church, and be the Church's friend,' &c.<sup>2</sup>

Crabbe himself was a seriously religious man, and his piety was perhaps warmer than Mrs. Oliphant would represent it. The conclusion of the *Hall of Justice*, at any rate, shows true devotional feeling. To be sure, he had a dislike for whatever seemed like fanaticism. In the fourth letter of the *Borough* he speaks with some tenderness of 'the Church of Rome, which here is poor and old,' and reserves his shafts of sarcasm for the 'Calvinistic' and 'Arminian' Methodists, who teach what we should now call revivalist doctrines as to instantaneous conversion and sensible assurance.

'It is the *Call!*<sup>3</sup> till that proclaims us free,  
In darkness, doubt, and bondage we must be;  
Till that assures us, we've in vain endured,  
And all is over when we're once assured.' . . .  
'How dropt you first, I ask, the legal yoke?  
What the first word the living witness spoke?  
Perceived you thunders roar, and lightnings shine,  
And tempests gathering ere the birth divine?'

Then the clerical *esprit de corps*, as we suppose it would be called, gives a mischievous turn to this ardent Wesleyan's experience.

'Feel you a quickening? drops the subject deep?  
Stupid and stony, no! you're all asleep;  
Listless and lazy, waiting for a close,  
As if at church.—Do I allow repose?  
Am I a legal minister? do I  
With form or rubric, rule or rite comply?  
Then whence this quiet, tell me, I beseech:  
One might believe you heard your Rector preach,  
Or his assistant dreamer,' &c.

<sup>1</sup> *Borough*, iv. xx. xxi.; *Tales*, iii. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> *Tales*, ix.

<sup>3</sup> Crabbe was accused of caricaturing this doctrine of Calvinistic Methodists in his *Abel Keene*. He answered by referring to a book which taught an extreme form of 'Quietism.'

We have dwelt the longer upon Crabbe, because we believe that he is now unduly neglected, and are persuaded that he is profitable for doctrine and reproof, if not so frequently for consolation.

We shall say but little of Mrs. Oliphant's account of the so-called Lake School. While doing homage to Wordsworth's greatness, she brings out the 'fanatical' element in his theory of poetry; the 'presumptuous mistake' represented by 'Betty Foy' and 'Susan Gale'; the extraordinary 'deterioration' in the second part of *Peter Bell*; the mighty poet's curious want of true humour; and the 'self-absorption' or 'solemn egotism' which was his greatest defect. Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner* is estimated as an unequalled interpretation of that solemn fact which the influences of our day, even more than of his, tend to eclipse—that human life is immersed in an atmosphere of mystery; and *Christabel* is placed side by side with it, or rather is treated as supplementary to it, being the picture of a dark assault directed by unseen forces of evil 'against white innocence, purity, and truth,' but without any such theory of the motive for this enmity as might tend to 'transfer our interest, as it has done in the *Paradise Lost*, to a being whose hate grows out of his despair. The poet's powers of discourse are described through the unfriendly medium of Carlyle; but we think that some reference might have been made to his published *Table Talk*, which is full of luminous and suggestive matter. Both Coleridge and Wordsworth are characterized as morally inferior to a far inferior poet, 'the noble, generous, and blameless Southey. . . . One of them wasted his existence, and was unfaithful to all his duties; the other shut himself up within himself;' while Southey 'bore the burdens of all connected with him, worked early and late, well or ill, with a cheerful devotion which no man has ever surpassed,' and was 'never too busy to have a cheerful greeting for all who came, and that tender courtesy of ready attention even to the irrelevant, *which is the genius of the heart*.' But Mrs. Oliphant had better not have talked of 'a certain grudge and sense of injustice in the arrangements of Providence,' and of the 'strange favouritism of heaven,' on the ground that 'this most admirable and excellent of men' did not attain to the highest rank among poets. Such language cannot be seriously employed by any believer in 'Providence'; and it is quite inadmissible as a hyperbolic expression of wonder at the inequalities of human destiny. If Southey was a better man than his fellow-poets, he *had* in greater

measur  
his we  
with t  
'went

W  
it) of  
art of  
presen  
of the  
and of  
of this  
the ch  
to be  
a lett  
tenary  
life we  
with s  
He is  
of the  
is muc  
in the  
one is  
Malag  
a cate  
his ve  
ment,  
deep  
often  
in 'u  
Mrs.  
'flowi  
. . . .  
strain.  
. . . .  
crimin  
was at  
thing  
music  
stand.  
a bris  
life an

T  
and l  
openi

measure the best gift that could come from above. It was his weakness to believe in his own poetic immortality; and with this 'blessed delusion,' as Mrs. Oliphant calls it, he 'went to his grave.'

We pass over the 'distressful drama' (as he himself called it) of Charles Lamb's life, and the 'new development of the art of criticism which took place in the beginning of the present century,' in order to hasten on to that third chapter of the second volume which, by reason alike of its subject and of the treatment of that subject, appears to us the gem of this whole series of studies in literary history. We mean the chapter on Walter Scott. And we will preface what has to be said with the heart-cheering words of Mr. Gladstone in a letter to Dean Ramsay, with reference to the Scott Centenary of 1871: 'Did we not possess a line from his pen, his life would stand as a true epic. . . . If he is out of fashion with some parts of some classes, it is their misfortune. . . . He is above fluctuations of time, for his place is in the hand of the Immortals.' Mrs. Oliphant's estimate of Scott's poetry is much the same as that of Mr. R. H. Hutton, as expressed in the series of *English Men of Letters*. (Would not Scott, one is disposed to ask, have demurred, in his 'Malachi Malagrowther' spirit, to being ranked *simpliciter* under such a category?) Mr. Hutton dwells much on the rapid flow of his verse—its 'hurried tramp, its force and swiftness of movement,' its Border-like bareness and simplicity, 'with a swift deep stream of strong pure feeling running through it,' feeling often intense but never subtle, always simple and direct, as in 'unsophisticated, hardy, and manly characters.' Just so Mrs. Oliphant speaks of it as

'flowing like a blithe Highland stream over its rocks and stones. . . . There are no metaphysics in the whole fresh, musical, daylight strain. . . . Perplexed by Wordsworth, confounded by Coleridge, . . . what wonder that the common world of not too wise or discriminating readers escaped into Scott with a sense of relief which was at once enthusiasm and gratitude! Here at least was something fine, something spirit-stirring, like a martial air, like the native music of their country, which everybody, thank heaven, could understand. . . . The strain . . . had swept through his own mind like a brisk melodious breeze before he transmitted it, all glowing with life and movement, to his audience,' &c. (ii. 113 ff.)

The Professor of Poetry at Oxford would go a step further, and bids us recognize in Scott's poetry—for instance, in the opening of the *Lay* and in the Flodden scenes of *Marmion*—a

living touch of true Homeric fire. 'If to a reader who could read no other language than his own I wished to convey an impression of what Homer was like, I should say, let him read the more heroic parts of Scott's poems.'<sup>1</sup>

But the Waverley Novels! Mrs. Oliphant speaks of the composition of the first in that wonderful series as 'one of the most extraordinary developments of unthought-of genius that ever was' (qu. were) 'known'. Does she not, however, somewhat misstate the case when she speaks (ii. 131) of the manuscript which contained the unfinished tale of *'Tis Sixty Years Since* as *twice* deliberately put aside by its author? What Scott says to Mr. Morritt (in a letter which she herself quotes, ii. 131) is that he had written part of it when he mislaid the MS., and only found it by accident when 'rummaging the drawers of an old cabinet,' after which recovery he rapidly completed the tale. According to the 'General Preface' to the Waverley novels, the first chapters were written about 1805, disapproved by a friend (poor Erskine!), and at once put away 'in the drawers of an old writing desk.' From a letter published by Lockhart, it appears that Scott showed them to James Ballantyne in 1810. In 1811 the desk to which they were restored 'was placed in a lumber garret, and entirely forgotten.' Scott 'sometimes' thought of the fragmentary story, but could not remember where he had placed the MS.; at last, 'happening to want some fishing tackle for a guest, it occurred to him to search the old writing desk in which he used to keep such articles; he got access to it with some difficulty, and in looking for lines the long-lost MS. presented itself: he immediately set to work to finish it,' and according to Lockhart, as quoted by Mrs. Oliphant, the latter part of the book was written between June 4 and July 1, 1814. She seems to have exaggerated (by some confusion of memory) the occasional recollections of the lost fragment into a second abandonment of the design. She also associates with the publication of *Waverley* the humorous declaration of Lord Holland, 'None of us went to bed, and nothing slept but my gout,' whereas the *Life of Scott* connects this speech with *Old Mortality*.<sup>2</sup>

The immense obligation of Scotland, as a country, to the novelist who suddenly made her familiar and beautiful to all the English-reading world—a work which Burns had never achieved—is unquestioned and unquestionable. But what of the reaction which, according to Mrs. Oliphant, began under

<sup>1</sup> Shairp's *Aspects of Poetry*, p. 378.

<sup>2</sup> Lockhart, ch. xxxvii.

the inf  
new sci  
pseud  
underg  
asham  
is the  
nothing  
elevati  
from th  
person  
accusat  
Scott's  
Mrs. O  
almost

'If  
visionar  
dents a  
of life,  
one set  
Scott w  
place a  
sheer p  
then let  
superfic

All  
'in he  
'not lo  
she wo  
aspect,  
a creat  
truthfu  
her to  
preven  
fashion

<sup>1</sup> 'S  
<sup>2</sup> Sc  
Marmi  
to prom  
neighb  
Whatev  
honest  
of these  
self-den  
as inspi  
Epistle  
had bee  
suggest

the influence of Carlyle, and has been kept going by 'the new school of analytical fiction' which we associate with the pseudonym of George Eliot? Why are schoolboys and undergraduates, not to speak of older readers, no longer ashamed of ignorance of the Waverley novels? What is the justice of the indictment that these books represent nothing high in moral aim, are ineffective for 'building up or elevating in any shape,' and exhibit characters 'fashioned from the skin inwards, not from the heart outwards,' not living persons but 'automatons'? Mr. Hutton meets this dyspeptic accusation by pointing to the strength and naturalness of Scott's masculine characters, and of not a few of his feminine.<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Oliphant gives a more thoroughgoing answer, in tones almost tremulous with indignation at the wrong.

'If it is unelevating and unimproving to fill a country with a visionary population, rich in every natural quality, with all the accidents and misadventures, all the tragic troubles and evanescent joys of life, and not one debasing image, not one impure suggestion, not one setting up of the evil over the good in the whole range,<sup>2</sup> then Scott was unelevating and unimproving; and if it is possible . . . to place a simple peasant woman by the side of Unas and Mirandas, in sheer potency of veracity and love—without virtue and without genius, then let us acknowledge that Scott's motives were mean and his power superficial (ii. 143).

All our readers will know who that 'peasant woman' is, 'in her Scotch severity and purity and infinite tenderness,' 'not lovely,' not attractive like the sister for whose deliverance she would do anything except lie; homely in manner as in aspect, and, except on one supreme occasion, in speech, 'yet a creature of the most heroic type, absolutely pure, absolutely truthful . . . but resolute that the truth her nature has forced her to respect shall not be used for harm if her very life can prevent it;' not vulgarly rewarded, in conventional novel-fashion, by any elevation above her natural rank, 'herself

<sup>1</sup> 'Scott,' in *English Men of Letters*, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> So Mr. Adolphus, in 1821, wrote of the works of 'the author of *Marmion*' and 'the author of *Waverley*:' 'There is a constant tendency to promote the desire of excellence in ourselves, and the love of it in our neighbours, by making us think honourably of our general nature. Whatever kindly or charitable affections, whatever principle of manly and honest ambition exists within us, is roused and stimulated by the perusal of these writings: our passions are won to the cause of justice, purity, and self-denial,' &c. In *C. Q. R.*, viii. 371, the Waverley novels are described as inspiring a high tone of feeling and principle, &c. In the Introductory Epistle to *The Fortunes of Nigel*, Scott intimates a modest hope that he had been able, in some instances, 'to fill the place of bad thoughts, or to suggest better.'

always,' and remaining herself as the minister's wife at Knock-tarlitie, in those quiet scenes which (herein differing from our authoress) we regard as a fit interlude between the fourth and fifth acts of the tragedy: and need we ask anyone what the cause of high morality, and of religious belief as quickening moral perceptions, owes to him who, having indeed the heroic achievement of Helen Walker as his basis, fashioned such an 'image of truth and virtue' as Jeanie Deans?

'No poet of his period,' says Mrs. Oliphant, 'so elevated, so consecrated the *truth*,' as sovereign over 'the claims of generosity and mercy,' as did he who 'has been accused of having no noble object, no thought of anything but money in his productions.' He himself says, 'No man of honour, genius, or spirit, would make the mere love of gain the chief, far less the only purpose of his labours.'<sup>1</sup> When people complain that, as an author, he shows no sense of a mission, they show that they do not understand the man himself. It was no affectation on his part to disparage his own books as a *few bits of novels*, while he attached an inordinate value to the work of his literary inferiors. This combination of modesty and generosity may well be as unintelligible to a self-conscious generation as Mr. Keble's humility is to ordinary Christians. Mr. Keble, we may add, in that remarkable essay on the *Life of Scott* in which he formulates his own theory of poetry, dwells fondly on this 'rare' and 'noble simplicity' of the great novelist.<sup>2</sup>

If people complain that Scott is not a philosophical novelist, that he does not interpret, or even illustrate, the thoughts of our own time, or that he is habitually looking back to a state of society which the world has well outlived, and has no sympathy with the popular movement which had begun to stir before he passed away, an old man at only sixty-one, may we not suggest to the objectors that theories have their day, and politics change their course, and that the claim made for Scott rests substantially on his success in portraying what is permanent and universal in humanity, and thus evoking sympathies which are coeval with the race? Mr. Francis Palgrave somewhere speaks of the 'many large interests, besides those of romance, which he realizes to us; the way in which he paints the whole life of men, not their humours or passions alone; his unflinching wholesomeness and freshness, like the sea and air and great elementary forces of nature.' Few writers, we suppose, could be more remote

<sup>1</sup> Introd. F.p. to *Fortunes of Nigel*.

<sup>2</sup> *Occasional Papers*, p. 58.



from Scott's religious or political position than Mr. Swinburne. Let us hear what he, a modern of moderns, has to say of the poet and romancer who idealized the feudal past, who loved, as Mrs. Oliphant puts it, 'the supremacy of the gentleman,' and whose influence contributed not a little to the forces which promoted the great ecclesiastical revival which he did not live to see, and which, probably, he would not himself have appreciated.

'Scott, with all his gaps and flaws, shortcomings and defects, must surely always retain the privilege of being . . . "the most beloved of English writers." . . . He demands nothing of his readers beyond a fair average allowance of kindliness and manhood. His popularity may fluctuate now and then with elder readers—so much the worse for them.' (Compare Mr. Gladstone's words, quoted above.) 'It is sure always to right itself again in a little time. . . . Love of Scott, if a child has not the ill fortune to miss, by some mischance, the benefit of his generous influence, is certain to outlast all changes of interest and inclination. . . . Almost any fault will seem pardonable in such a benefactor . . . so that the sternest republican may bless him when he is most a royalist—yea, even a Georgian royalist.'<sup>1</sup>

He has said in the same context—

'Scott was neither a profound nor a pretentious critic, neither a refined nor an eccentric theorist; but his judgments have always the now more than ever invaluable quality of clearness and consistency.'

We agree with Mrs. Oliphant in thinking that the *Heart of Midlothian* is one of the best types of Scott's work. We should even go further and say that it is, on the whole, that one of his novels which the world would be most impoverished by parting with. But, though reluctant to expatiate on this theme beyond Mrs. Oliphant's lead, we may ask our readers to think of other Waverley novels which are not only rich in 'humour and wisdom and noble sentiment,' but are, in an ethical sense, bracing, stimulating, or admonitory. For instance, do we learn nothing from Edward Waverley as to indulged dreaminess producing habitual indecision, or from Nigel as to the weakness which, under fear of ridicule, will 'affect the reputation' of fashionable guilt? Are there no lessons of a large humanity in the appeal of Isaac of York to Wilfrid, or in the sympathy of our dear 'Antiquary' with the rough fisherman bereaved of his firstborn? Has womanhood derived no inspiration from

<sup>1</sup> *Nineteenth Century*, April 1884.

such ideals as Rebecca, Catherine Glover, Alice Lee, or Minna Troil as she appears at the end of the *Pirate*? Do we not repeatedly, and sometimes quite unexpectedly, come across brief sentences which put old truths into forms which make them new? 'The Devil always finds logic to convince his followers' (*St. Ronan's Well*). 'We have known many whose curtains have been shrewdly shaken by superstition, though their fears were unsanctioned by any religious faith' (*Woodstock*). When Cedric, in *Ivanhoe*, exhorts Ulrica to repent, she tells him that 'the maddening love of pleasure' and 'the keen appetite of revenge' are 'draughts too intoxicating for the human heart to bear, and yet retain the power to repent'; and in the awful chapter on Front-de-Bœuf's death-bed, 'remorse without repentance' is ranked among the miseries of hell. But enough of such illustrations of Scott's power as an unconscious teacher; nor can we do more than hint at the vast amount of historic illumination which, in spite of numberless inaccuracies and anachronisms, is contained in the greater stories, or at the insight which, as Mr. Hutton expresses it, they give us into 'public life and political issues,'<sup>1</sup> and this without a grain of Lord Lytton's or of Lord Beaconsfield's artificiality. Nor can we forget how honestly he has exhibited the faults of those classes or institutions which attracted his imaginative sympathy—the Cavaliers, the Highland chiefs, the Stuart government; how he recognizes the element of 'ardent enthusiasm' in Cromwell, and even graces William of Cumberland with some princeliness of spirit; how Dean Stanley describes him as 'holding the balance' in the *Abbot* 'between the conflicting parties of that time,'<sup>2</sup> although he throws the interest around the *victa causa*. Mrs. Oliphant, while defending his desire to found a family, blames him freely for his unfortunate self-immersion in a publishing business, but says, as so many have said or felt, that 'the last chapter of his life,' which exhibits him as struggling to satisfy his creditors, is 'one of the most noble known to man;' and yet she finds 'a certain want of generosity and justice in the praise sometimes bestowed upon himself at the expense of his work.' Mr. Hutton does indeed say that 'the man was much greater than his ends,' and that adversity brought out in him nobler elements than prosperity had displayed. This

<sup>1</sup> *Scott*, p. 101. He goes on to speak of 'the tonic influence, the large instructiveness, the stimulating intellectual air, of Scott's historic tales.' How much might be learnt by any one who would work out the historical or biographical allusions in any one of these stories!

<sup>2</sup> *Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, p. 401.

is not to disparage his *work*; and we suppose that all readers of Lockhart will admit the want, amid 'the broad sunshine,' of something which should 'touch the heroic point.' 'In the years of reverse . . . that something seemed to be supplied.'

Scott's religiousness was genuine, if not fervent. Mr. Adolphus says that his writings exhibit a 'native piety,' and a readiness on all fitting occasions to 'pay homage to religion,' as pre-eminent 'among the causes of human happiness, and as the only certain source of pure and elevated thoughts and upright, benevolent, and magnanimous actions.' If, as Mr. Keble and Mr. Hutton remark, he sometimes acquiesced in a lowered moral standard, we must observe with the former that his 'position, in respect to religious truth and duty, was a very disadvantageous one;' that his early revolt 'against the strict Calvinism of his father's family,' and the laxity of that Edinburgh society amid which he grew up to manhood, might have combined to involve him in free-living or free-thinking ways. He was opposed, on principle, to religious excitement; and this led him, in a very pathetic passage of the *Heart of Midlothian*, to speak as if prayer had only a subjective efficacy. But he could pray in his Diary, 'Lord, keep us from all temptation, for we cannot be our own shepherd.'<sup>1</sup> Stoic as he might affect to be, he could face the prospect of ruin by transcribing Job i. 21; when he thought himself dying, in 1819, he said he knew how 'weak and filthy' every human life must 'appear in the eyes of God,' but that he 'relied on the merits and intercession of our Redeemer;' when actually dying in 1832, he told Lockhart that nothing but a 'virtuous and religious' life would 'give any comfort' on a death-bed.

A few months before, when at Rome, he had said with moistened eyes, 'I have been perhaps the most voluminous author of the day; and it *is* a comfort to me to think that I have tried to unsettle no man's faith, to corrupt no man's principle, and that I have written nothing which on my death-bed I should wish blotted.' These words, so affecting in their humble simplicity, do but give the negative side of the matter. On the positive side it is enough to add to what has been said the remark of his biographer, that 'his works teach the practical lessons of morality and Christianity in the most captivating form—unobtrusively and unaffectedly.'

The name of William Godwin is introduced with some remarks on the soreness generated in the minds of cultivated

<sup>1</sup> Lockhart, ch. lxxii.

Dissenting ministers, at any rate of an earlier generation, by 'their generally hopeless confinement within a petty circle of uneducated and narrow-minded people.' It was not unnatural that such persons, of whom Godwin's father was one, should imagine themselves the objects of 'systematic disparagement,' and forthwith attribute it to the Church's social ascendancy. From this 'sentimental grievance' would spring a 'deep-lying resentment,' which might make them think abstention from all public worship better than attendance at the services of the detested Church. Amid such a domestic atmosphere the future author of *Political Justice* and *Caleb Williams* grew up; he took up at first a position of vigorous Puritanism,<sup>1</sup> but gradually drifted into Socinianism, then into Deism, then into scepticism as to the very existence of God. The special interest of his life consists in his advocacy of 'absolute theoretical lawlessness.' He came to think that the interests of morality and of human happiness could only be secured by the removal of all restraints on human liberty. He was, in some sort, a pacific Nihilist; justice with him was the contradiction and destruction of all law, of all penalties for the infringement of law, and generally of all restrictive authority. Marriage was a wrong, being 'the worst of laws'; distinctive property was a wrong; education was a wrong; every form of 'Thou shalt not' was a wrong: for it should be substituted 'Thou mayest do anything that thou wilt.' Mrs. Oliphant of course condemns 'the folly of such a sentiment' in the light of human self-knowledge; yet she bestows upon it, as a sentiment, a good deal of admiration, describing it as

'full of chivalrous and magnanimous feeling, and the poetry of that faith in Man, the image of God, which has inspired more or less all great movements. . . . Godwin's theory was founded upon a lofty, if entirely overweening estimate of the power, independence, and natural virtue of mankind. Left entirely to his own instincts, to his own sense of what was good and what bad, undemoralized by fictitious restraints . . . it was a fine and noble idea that man would at once reach a state of high and voluntary virtue. His capacity for this—nay, the certainty that, if left to himself, he would prove his possession of every noble quality—was at the bottom of all those impassioned claims of right, and assertions of universal liberty, which were the language of the time,' &c. (ii. 234).

For our parts, we do not discern so much 'beauty' in this upgrowth of a childish, not childlike, ignorance, and of a pride

<sup>1</sup> He professed himself a Sandemanian. But Sandemanianism is not, as Mrs. Oliphant seems to think, simply ultra-Calvinism. See the *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, &c.*

that  
of s  
neve  
for v  
othe  
that  
into  
siste  
cond  
in ob  
prin  
of d  
but a  
of co  
may  
sionl  
cern  
logic  
but '  
instit  
Mary  
on to  
spond  
Engli  
a pra  
Godw  
'theor  
says I  
'duty  
grave a  
tion of  
not as  
the fac  
an offe  
. . . .  
and the  
obey.  
visionar  
sinned  
Shelley  
insists s  
ledged'  
Ag  
'By  
spirit of

that had its root in atheism. Carlyle's words, as to the reign of such fancies in the years preceding the Revolution, can never be out of date. 'As to this of sentimentalism, so useful for weeping with over romances and on pathetic occasions, it otherwise will verily avail nothing—nay, less. The healthy heart that said to itself, "How healthy am I!" was already fallen into the fatallest sort of disease. Is not sentimentalism twin sister to cant?' Again, '*Thou shalt* was from of old the condition of man's being, and his weal and blessedness was in obeying that.'<sup>1</sup> Reliance on human nature, apart from a principle of restorative purification, and from that discipline of duty which makes men of those who accept it, what is it but a form of that 'folly' in which the Bible shows us matter of condemnation? Godwin himself, Mrs. Oliphant tells us, may not himself have cherished this romantic faith. 'His passionless intelligence wrought out his theory, without any concern for its application or practical use. It was a matter of logic to him, and fundamental truth.' He was no revolutionist, but 'a respectable London citizen;' and he 'submitted to an institution which he wished to see abandoned' by marrying Mary Wollstonecraft. But his name and his wife's carry us on to Shelley, who became a disciple of Godwin's, by correspondence, in 1812, and eloped—one must say, in plain English, adulterously—with his daughter in 1814. This was a practical application of the theory of 'No law,' which Godwin, it appears, did not regard complacently. The 'theory' was a passion with Shelley. To him and to Byron, says Mrs. Oliphant in a striking passage—

'duty had no existence, nor authority, nor the restraints of nature grave and chaste. Their principle was that of self-will, the satisfaction of desire, the destruction of control, the perfect liberty of doing, not as they ought, but as they would. To Shelley's fantastic soul the fact that a certain thing "ought" to be done made the doing of it an offence against human freedom. It was not that he loved evil . . . but immorality, as we name it, was to him a matter of principle, and the wish of the moment a sacred impulse which it was duty to obey. Byron, a thousand times less innocent, was without this visionary philosophical preference for the forbidden, and while he sinned was ever conscious of a tremor of conscience; but with Shelley all instincts were good, and that self-will which Christianity insists shall be subdued was the only god and potentate he acknowledged' (iii. 59).

Again—

'Byron and Shelley were the children of the Revolution. The spirit of wild discontent on one side, and wilder visionary longing

<sup>1</sup> *French Revolution*, i. 66, ii. 127.

for a new system and form of life on the other, had got into their veins. Obedience, discipline and order, and all the established sanctities of home and family, of law and government, were to them tyrannical prejudices of the past. . . . To both these weary souls the conditions of Revolution lasted all their lives long; they never got out of that fatal atmosphere. . . . Even what they loved became repulsive to them when it was associated with the idea of duty. The fantastic freedom of a classic Faun, to roam where it would, to enjoy as it would, to dart away at every impulse, was in Shelley's ethereal nature, only half human and altogether irresponsible' (iii. 129).

We demur to these last phrases. A 'Faun' is not a particularly 'ethereal' conception, and there was nothing of heavenward aspiration in such a 'nature' as is here described; and to call it 'only half human and altogether irresponsible' is surely to use 'unreal words.' What Mrs. Oliphant means, we presume, is what Principal Shairp has expressed in the suggestion that Shelley 'was in some way deficient in rational and moral sanity,'<sup>1</sup> an hypothesis which one is glad to accept.

'Byron,' proceeds Mrs. Oliphant, 'was of the earth, earthy—a totally different kind of being. . . . He followed the law of his appetites and senses, without any doubt on the point that it was bad to do so, but with a braggart's pleasure in the badness, as a proof of his courage and power of rebellion against heaven itself, which he was never unwilling to appease privately by acknowledgment of his insubordination. His was in every way the lower side of the great rebellion.'

Mrs. Oliphant concludes the chapter with this sentence:

'By this time, perhaps—who can tell?—these changed and perfected voices, in fullest harmony and measure, are preparing for us the songs to be sung in heaven' (iii. 131).

This is to touch somewhat too lightly on a very solemn and awful theme. What have we to do with speculating as to the position of two such souls before the Eternal Justice and Mercy? Let us say this only, that they and 'all souls are His;' and let us remember that those who have had opportunities which were denied to men so richly endowed, and so easily withdrawn (as Mrs. Oliphant remarks) from the training of a wide experience, cannot hope to take part in the 'songs' of the next life, unless in this life they recognize His service as their freedom.

We must leave unnoticed several figures which pass before the readers of Mrs. Oliphant's third volume. Many pages

<sup>1</sup> *Aspects of Poetry*, p. 232.



are very amusing, and some recall the welcome memory of our first acquaintance with Miss Edgeworth's Irish tales (now, we fear, almost unknown) and with Miss Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, or, dearer still to our taste, with the inexhaustible charm of her *Persuasion*. Passing on to graver matters, we find the special advantage of Mrs. Oliphant's guidance in the vivid personal touches which point beyond the passionless austerity of Hallam's work to the four bereavements which desolated his home; or tenderly remind us that Lingard, the 'honest and dignified partisan,' was a 'humble priest, with his little flock about him, saying his Mass in his village chapel; retiring among his books, interrupted, perhaps, in the middle of a chapter to carry salvation to some sick bed; putting away the Cardinal's hat, with perhaps a touch of fine impatience, as an interruption to "the progress of my *History*."'<sup>1</sup> There is a lively picture, too, of the quaintnesses and weaknesses of Bentham, followed up by an account of 'the Utilitarian theory,' which has been contributed by 'C. F. Oliphant,' and from which we quote a few words.

'That its tendency to increase the general happiness is an element, and a considerable element, in the goodness of an action, no one would venture to deny; but Sir James Mackintosh, with the bulk of modern philosophers, while acknowledging this, yet made the distinction that, while the idea is inseparable from our notion of moral approbation, it is entirely and easily to be distinguished from the sources of our moral action,' &c. (iii. 360).

Three or four pages are given to the 'astounding training' of John Stuart Mill, who is described as 'one of the strangest compounds of human qualities and paradoxes which the world has known . . . whose rigidity of second nature, the art and influence of his father, never ceased to jar against, yet never overcame, the docility and softness of the first.' In that father, one of the most unloveable of men, the solemn pedantry of the philosophical Scot was united to a systematic educational tyranny, 'without ruth or thought for the flesh and blood he was straining,' yet, from his own standpoint, well intended. Mrs. Oliphant just glances at his unbelief: we may add that it was not a dogmatic atheism, but a formulated agnosticism; that it was probably intensified by recoil from Calvinism; that it involved a hatred of religion

<sup>1</sup> But when we are told that Lingard 'died before anybody had dreamed that Cardinal Archbishops would flourish again in England' (p. 301), we must observe that Mrs. Oliphant, at p. 366, dates his death in 1851, the year after the restoration of the 'hierarchy.'

as 'the greatest enemy to morality;' and that it was inculcated on his son with a vehement absolutism which would go far to determine the latter's posture of mind upon the subject. It is with regret for the early death of one who had already done good service to the cause of faith, and who was a contributor to our own pages, that we refer to a paper on the *Autobiography of John Stuart Mill*, by Walter R. Browne, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.<sup>1</sup>

The last chapter in Mrs. Oliphant's work is devoted to theologians; but there was not much theology in the period which she had undertaken to survey. She has something to say about the Evangelical school, which 'in the beginning of the century . . . was supreme;' and she notes with the half-amused air of a student of 'the curious intricacies of nature' the combination, in their typical men, of very unworldly sentiments with a 'prosperous, luxurious, enjoyable life . . . in a pleasant commotion of congenial society.' She describes the object of William Wilberforce in his *Practical View*—the awakening of a real sense of Christian truth and duty in the well-to-do and upper-class people, whose professions were belied by their easy-going irreligiousness. And here she remarks, with a touch of her delicate, half-veiled sarcasm—

'It is to be feared that to Wilberforce that broad and conciliatory treatment which translates the time-worn language of Christianity into the phraseology of its philosophical opponents, by way of betraying these latter tenderly into something like faith, or approval at least, would have appeared flat blasphemy. He would have had no understanding for the process which turns the love of Christ into the Enthusiasm of Humanity. The society which he addressed was not one which required such methods. It was as much Christian as orthodoxy required. . . . What made the heart of the good man burn within him was to see how completely it could ignore the creed it held. . . . The insidious idea that it did not much matter what a man believed, so long as he did believe sincerely, and lived a life in accordance with his principles, was to him a poison terrible to contemplate' (iii. 377).

In this latter sentence, however, we see a different form of evil from the spiritual apathy which had made an orthodox belief to be like salt that had lost its savour; for it is the idea of popular Latitudinarianism. The remaining pages of this chapter are taken up with the religious careers of Dean Milner, Simeon, Robert Hall, Chalmers, and Irving. Simeon's devotion to 'the service and love of Christ' is duly recognized, while his collection of 'skeleton sermons' draws forth some

<sup>1</sup> Published by the Christian Evidence Society in 1874.

banter. Hall, whom some readers will know best through Lord Lytton's *Caxtons*, is described as a man of 'the most dauntless heroic nature.' It seems odd to call Chalmers 'the great Dissenter;' but he is also estimated as 'a primitive prophet, a mediæval leader, and a Scotch Borderer;' and his language on 'the modesty of true science' tempts Mrs. Oliphant to remark that he 'might have been less certain' on that point 'had he lived to our day.' We gladly conclude our extracts with her striking description of Irving as having 'no sense of any limit save in that withholding of God's grace which is the most terrible of punishments, the saddest proof of man's indifference or unwillingness to seek His aid.'

Quotations less numerous than those in which we have been led to indulge would give our readers a fair impression of the beauty and energy of Mrs. Oliphant's style, and also, we must add, of its peculiar delicious humorousness, and of a pathos the more impressive because its tone is so subdued. She can, indeed, write exquisite English, but occasionally a slight degree of carelessness is observable. We have noticed one or two cases in which, for instance, 'he' occurs in a dependent clause where the grammar requires 'him.' Here and there, too, there is an inaccuracy, as when Louis XIV. is referred to as the father, instead of the great-grandfather, of Louis XV. (i. 18); or when some words of S. Peter are attributed to S. Paul (i. 83). Sacred poetry is not much to Mrs. Oliphant's taste; in a gentle sort of way she grudges the popularity which 'the multitude,' or 'simple-hearted religious crowd,' awards to it (ii. 352, 383); in speaking of Heber and of Milman she does not name the hymn for Trinity Sunday, and seems insensible to the merits of the *Fall of Jerusalem* and the *Martyr of Antioch*.

We conclude by thanking the accomplished authoress for a work which surpasses many a novel in charm and interest, while it fulfils the requirements of a serious Literary History.

## ART. II.—THE TEXTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF GREEK LITURGIES.

1. *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*. Edited by E. RE-NAUDOT. (Francofurti ad Moenum, 1847. A Reprint.)
2. *Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church*. By J. M. NEALE. (London, 1850.)
3. *Analecta Ante-Nicæna*. Vol. III. Edited by C. BUNSEN. (London, 1852.)
4. *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. Edited by C. E. HAMMOND. (Oxford, 1878.)
5. *The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from Original Authorities*. Edited by C. A. SWAINSON. (Cambridge, 1884.)<sup>1</sup>

A VAST advance has been made in England in the last half century in the study of Liturgiology, both Eastern and Western. Ancient MS. Service Books have been edited with care and copiously illustrated. Mediæval Missals and Breviaries have been reprinted under the auspices of Literary Societies and University Presses. Liturgies 'ad normam hodie acceptam,' always accessible as far as the Western Church was concerned, were difficult to procure in the case of the Oriental rites until they were placed within every student's reach by the more or less recent editions of Renaudot, Neale, Bunsen, Hammond, and Swainson, the full titles of whose works have been prefixed to this Article.

We desire to call special attention to the last-named work, not only because it is the most recent, but because it has struck out a new path, making important investigations possible, and putting important conclusions within our reach. The previously-named editors, with the single and partial exception of Bunsen, had, so far as Greek Liturgies go, merely reprinted the texts of earlier and scarcer editions without testing their accuracy, or collating fresh manuscripts. Dr. Swainson, with the aid of able Continental coadjutors, has not only tested the accuracy of the labours of his predecessors, and given us finally-corrected transcripts of certain well-known MSS., but he has either printed or collated, for the first time, a considerable number of early- and late-mediæval MSS. of importance.

We present a *résumé* of his labours in this respect,

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the following pages the fourth book in the above list is referred to as H., the fifth book as S.

omit  
whic  
cont  
not  
the  
colum  
(pp.  
been  
the p  
to cr  
face  
not  
every  
valua  
study  
T  
F  
Ross  
but c  
origin  
Vatic  
ment  
S  
MS.,  
suppl  
of the  
12th-  
MS. l  
printe  
lished  
and o  
MSS.  
Goar'  
13th  
printe  
the F  
Liturg  
T  
Barbe  
fresh  
tions o  
MS. l  
collati  
Leo T  
in 153

omitting all reference to the late Æthiopic fragment with which the volume incongruously concludes, and to its other contents appended by way of illustration, with which we are not now concerned. As to method, we merely remark that the arrangement of the variously-dated texts in parallel columns adopted in the case of the Liturgy of S. James (pp. 214-32) is very convenient, and we wish that it had been adhered to throughout the whole work. We waive, for the present, all other criticism, not because there is nothing to criticize, but because criticism would be ungracious in the face of the obligations under which Dr. Swainson has laid, not only the English Church, but Liturgical students of every Communion, and we beg to thank him for the most valuable contribution which this generation has seen to the study of Liturgiology.

The editor prints:—

Firstly, the Liturgy of S. Mark, from (1) the Codex Rossanensis, as printed by Drouard and subsequent editors, but collated afresh with and corrected by a copy of the original MS. furnished to the editor by Mr. Stevenson; (2) a Vatican roll, dated 1207, hitherto unpublished; (3) a fragmentary Messina roll, 12th century, hitherto unpublished.

Secondly, the Liturgy of S. Basil, from (1) the Barberini MS., 8th century, as printed by Bunsen, with fresh collations supplied by Mr. Stevenson, and with the eight missing leaves of that MS. supplied from Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 22749, a 12th-century roll hitherto unpublished; (2) an 11th-century MS. belonging to Lady Burdett-Coutts (= B.C. iii. 42), here printed for the first time, with collations of another unpublished MS. in the same collection (= B.C. i. 10, 12th century), and of three unpublished MSS. in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 22749, 12th century, and 27563, 27564, 14th century. Goar's collations of certain early MSS. (C. G. 1, G. 2, 11th-13th cent.) are likewise reproduced. (3) The text as printed by Ducas in 1526, with references to the reprints in the Roman Euchology of 1873, and in Mr. Hammond's *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*.

Thirdly, the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, from (1) the Barberini MS., 8th century, as printed by Bunsen, with fresh collations supplied by Mr. Stevenson, and with collations of the Codex Rossanensis; (2) the hitherto unpublished MS. belonging to Lady Burdett-Coutts, B.C. iii. 42, with collations of B.C. i. 10, and of a Latin translation made by Leo Thuscus c. A.D. 1110; (3) the text as printed by Ducas in 1536.

Fourthly, the Liturgy of the Presanctified, from (1) the Barberini MS., 8th century, for the first time, with collations of the Codex Rossanensis; (2) B.C. iii. 42, with collations of B.C. i. 10; (3) the text as printed by Ducas in 1536.

Fifthly, the Liturgy of S. Peter, a cento of the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom and the Roman Missal, from the Codex Rossanensis with collations of a 14th-century MS. at Paris (Bibl. Nat. Suppl. Gr. 476).

Sixthly, the Liturgy of S. James, from (1) the Rotulus Messanensis, a mutilated 10th-century MS.; (2) the Codex Rossanensis, 12th century, now printed for the first time; (3, 4) two MSS. at Paris (Bibl. Nat. Gr. 2502, and Suppl. Gr. 476), both of the 14th century, and both now published for the first time.

Such are the valuable materials, forming a large addition to the previously existing stock of knowledge about the text of the Greek Liturgies, collected together and many of them printed for the first time by Dr. Swainson. Nevertheless, his work is not exhaustive. There are uncollated and unpublished MSS. of Greek Liturgies lying in European libraries, mostly within easy reach of home, which we could wish that an English editor had at least mentioned, and if possible collated, in a volume of this character. Among them are the following:—

Name of Liturgy	Place of MS.	Press Mark	Date : Century	Remarks
S. Basil	Messina	?	X.	Mentioned by Dr. Swainson, xviii. l. 18. p.
"	Bodleian Library	Miscell. 78	XII.	
"	Bodleian Library	Laud. Græc. 28	XII.	
"	Bodleian Library	Cromwell 11	1225	
"	Bodleian Library	Barocc. 42	XVI.	
"	Bodleian Library	Barocc. 107	XVI.	
"	Brit. Mus.	Harl. 5561	XIII.	
S. Chrysostom	Paris Bib. Nat.	Suppl. Gr. 577	XV.	
"	Vatican Library	?	?	Mentioned by Dr. Swainson, xix. l. 11. p.
"	Bodleian Library	Miscell. 78	XII.	



Name of Liturgy	Place of MS.	Press Mark	Date: Century	Remarks
S. Chrysostom	Bodleian Library	Barocc. 42	XVI.	
"	Brit. Mus.	Harl. 5561	XIII.	
S. Peter	Paris Bib. Nat.	Gr. 2509	XIV.	Mass of the Holy Trinity.
"	Bodleian Library	Barocc. 8	XVI.	Mass of the Holy Spirit.
Of the Presanctified	Bodleian Library	Miscell. 78	XII.	
"	Bodleian Library	Barocc. 42	XVI.	
"	Bodleian Library	Barocc. 107	XVI.	
"	Brit Mus.	Harl. 5561	XIII	

The above list may serve as a nucleus for Liturgiologists to work upon. We do not pretend that it is complete, and doubtless it will be added to; but until some one shall have described and collated these and other such MSS., or until some MS. is discovered earlier than the Barberini Codex, Dr. Swainson's book will remain the standard authority on the question of the text of Greek Liturgies.

The material which he has collected is sufficient in quantity and variety of date to enable us to present our readers with a *résumé* of the variations which the texts of Greek Liturgies have undergone, together with their causes. We cannot penetrate behind the eighth century. The period earlier than that century is in darkness, to be illumined by quotations from the Canons of Eastern Councils and from the writings of early Fathers. No complete catena of such passages exists. Mr. Hammond published in a handy form in 1879 extracts bearing on the subject from S. Chrysostom's works, but the pamphlet only relates to the writings of a single Father, and does not profess to be exhaustive even within those limits.

The earliest extant Liturgical text is the valuable uncial MS. known as the Barberini Codex, containing the Liturgies of S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and of the Presanctified, and belonging, as we shall presently show, to the eighth century, although for some unaccountable and unexplained reason Dr. Swainson throughout his recent volume refers to it as of 'the eighth or ninth century.' But the palæographical side of his volume is unfortunately weak. Dr. Swainson never submits a sufficiently detailed description of any MS. to

justify the date which he assigns to it, nor are there any fac-similes to enable a reader to judge for himself.

Starting, then, from the eighth century, we can trace forms and causes of addition to, omission from, and variation in, the language of Eastern Liturgies. The mere suggestion of the existence of any variations will be a rude shock to a widespread belief, which has much, otherwise, to justify it, in the immutability of the Eastern Church. While Rome has altered, Constantinople prides herself on having remained unaltered. In the glowing description with which Dr. Neale commences the Introduction to his work on the Holy Eastern Church, he enumerates among other evidences of such immutability her 'venerable Liturgies exhibiting doctrine unchanged and discipline uncorrupted.' But an examination of MS. Texts, now for the first time possible in the case of ordinary students, proves that neither doctrine, nor discipline, nor ritual, has remained unchanged, and that in these respects, so far as the Altar Service is concerned, the Holy Eastern has altered as much as the Holy Roman Church. Indeed, in Western Christendom, since the suppression of the ancient and independent Liturgies of France, Spain, and Great Britain, nothing is more remarkable than the very slight variations which have taken place in the text of the Gregorian Canon.

The varieties which are found in the texts of Eastern Liturgies differ in origin, character, and significance, and may, for convenience, be classified under the following heads. The reader of ancient texts will be well advised, before jumping at any conclusion from various readings which may from time to time present themselves, to decide first of all under which of the following divisions they are to be classed.

(i.) *Omissions for the sake of brevity on the part of older MS. texts.*

Before the arts of printing and of paper-making had been invented and developed, parchment and ink were comparatively expensive articles. Writing was a slow process, as well as a skilled and costly occupation. Consequently, on economical grounds, it was desirable to abbreviate written matter as much as possible. Thus the mention of some points universally understood was omitted altogether by Liturgical copyists, and well-known rubrics, collects, or other sentences were indicated by one or more opening words. The Triumphal Hymn which is given in full in printed editions of the Liturgy of S. Basil (H. p. 108) is represented by the single word *Ἀγνος* in the Barberini MS. (S. p. 80).

The Cherubic Hymn given in full in the printed Liturgy of S. Mark (H. p. 178) is represented by its four opening words in Codex Rossanensis—Οἱ τὰ χειρουβὶμ μυστικῶς—and is only alluded to in an obscure rubric in the Rotulus Vaticanus (S. p. 22). Numerous instances could be given of such abbreviations. Three occur in a single printed page of the Barberini MS. (S. p. 93). In one case we are left in some doubt as to whether the shorter reading of an older MS. at the Commixture in S. Mark's Liturgy is a complete sentence, Ἴδου ἡγιασται καὶ τετελειώται (S. p. 66), or only an abbreviation of the longer sentence in other MSS.—καὶ γέγονεν εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ διαδίδονται τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις (S. p. 67). Set forms of terminal doxology of frequent occurrence are seldom written in full. This form of variation, which presents to the eye a superficial difference of text has to be mentioned, but not as involving any real liturgical alteration.

The next class of alterations is of more importance, because it includes real changes in the text, not necessarily, if ever, of doctrinal significance, but introduced solely or chiefly for the purpose of shortening the service.

(ii.) *Omissions for the sake of brevity on the part of the modern texts.*

Under this head we include the following subdivisions:—

(a) Omissions of syllables: διαφύλαξον (S. p. 86), φύλαξον (H. p. 130).

(b) Omission of a word or words, consisting for the most part of redundant language or superfluous epithets or expressions, e.g.:—

1. Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς [ἁγίας] Πεντηκοστῆς. (S. p. 278; H. p. 43.)
2. τῆς σῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς [καὶ ἀποστολικῆς] ἐκκλησίας. (*Ibid.*)
3. [ἁγίας] ἐνδόξου Σιών. (S. p. 280; H. p. 43.)
4. προσφέρεται τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἁγίῳ σου καὶ θυσία [καθαρά, ἐπιθυσία] καὶ προσφορά. (S. p. 30; H. p. 180.)
5. Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ [καὶ ἐλάχιστοι] τῶν ζωοποιῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ τε σωτηρίου σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, [καὶ τῆς ταφῆς,] καὶ τῆς τριμήρου κ.τ.λ. (S. p. 274; H. p. 42.)
6. [ἀειμενὴ καὶ ἄσειστον καὶ ἀχέμαστον αὐτὴν διαφύλαξον] ῥνόμενος αὐτὴν κ.τ.λ. (S. p. 280; H. p. 43.)

In the above passages the words within brackets occur in the older MS., but are omitted in the modern printed text.

An element which has disappeared in Liturgies, as we have them at present, is the personal element, consisting of references to the Priest himself, the assistant ministers, or to the dignified clergy of the church where the MS. was in use. Some of these omitted passages correspond to the now obsolete but once frequent 'Apologiæ Sacerdotis' in Western Missals. The Great Oblation in S. James's Liturgy, which now ends with a petition that God would not reject the people because of the sins of the Priest (H. p. 42), concluded thus in the Codex Rossanensis:—

μηδὲ ἀποστραφείην σὺν αὐτοῖς τεταπεινωμένους, κατησχυμμένους· ἀλλ' ἰλεως γένου μοι τῷ ἀχρείῳ δούλῳ σου. (S. p. 276.)

The Great Intercession in the same Liturgy once contained the following petitions of a personal character which are now omitted. After prayer, then as now, for 'the holy and glorious Sion' the mother of all the Churches' (an expression which may remind us of the language of the Irish S. Columbanus to Pope Boniface IV. allowing a high place of honour to the Church of Rome, second and inferior only to that of the Church of Jerusalem<sup>1</sup>), petitions were introduced for:—(a) the most holy Patriarch; (b) presbyters, deacons, ecclesiastical officers, and laity; (c) the ministers at the present altar; (d) the celebrating priest; (e) the attendant deacons; (f) the holy city (Jerusalem) and the imperial city (Constantinople) and the monastery where the MS. was written; (g) the Emperor;<sup>2</sup> (h) Christians suffering persecution, God being implored to cast down the haughtiness of the heathen, and to exalt the horn of the Christians.<sup>3</sup>

Of these intercessions (d) and (e) occur only, and in an abbreviated form, in the Liturgy as at present used. The Patriarch was again prayed for by name between the 'Sancta sanctis' and the Fraction.<sup>4</sup>

Still more lengthy personal allusions were introduced into the prayers for the departed and the diptychs of the dead, which must have made the service wearisomely long, and

<sup>1</sup> τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἐνδόξου Σιὸν τῆς μητρὸς πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. H. p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Warren's *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> The plural βασιλέων being used in some, the singular βασιλεὺς in other MSS. The same confusion between 'imperatore' and 'imperatoribus' occurs in early Western Missals. *Ibid.* pp. 252, 254.

<sup>4</sup> κατάβαλε τὸ φρύγμα τῶν ἐθνῶν ὥψωσον κέρας χριστιανῶν. S. p. 286; om. in H. p. 44.

<sup>5</sup> S. p. 310 compared with H. p. 49.

whi  
Litu  
The  
from  
σοι  
ὀνόμ  
sal,  
Litu  
clau  
ἐμνη  
Litu  
quon  
210.

for,  
(b) S  
Test  
And  
Jam  
ment  
Barn  
ment  
Shen  
(e) T  
Aaro  
Nath  
Ezek  
Zeph  
Hagg  
(g) T  
forty  
tius,  
mon,  
and  
and I  
the E  
Anas  
nike,  
Cilici  
(i) A  
Athan  
ronius  
ment,

which were evidently omitted for the sake of shortening the Liturgy. But the omitted passages are of singular interest. The petition alluding to the names just previously read out from the diptychs, which ends now with the words τῶν ἀρτίως σοι ἀναγινωσκομένων, then added ὦν σὺ, Κύριε, γινώσκεις τὰ ὀνόματα. These words resemble a phrase in the Stowe Missal, not, as far as we are aware, found elsewhere in Western Liturgies: 'quorum Deus non nominavit et novit.'<sup>1</sup> The next clause introduces the phrase ὦν ἐμνήσθημεν καὶ ὦν οὐκ ἐμνήσθημεν ὀρθοδόξων, which resembles a prayer in the Coptic Liturgy of S. Cyril for all 'quorum nomina recitamus et quorum non recitamus . . . qui dormierunt, &c.' (H. p. 210.)

The diptychs enumerate the following saints to be prayed for, and in the following order:—(a) The Ever-Virgin Mary. (b) S. John the Baptist. (c) Twenty Apostles and other New Testament saints, thus curiously arranged: Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James, Simon, Judas (can this be Iscariot? Thaddæus is mentioned afterwards), Matthias, Mark, Luke, Thaddæus, Barnabas, Timothy, Titus, Ananias. (d) Thirteen Old Testament patriarchs: Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Melchizedek, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Job. (e) Twenty-four Old Testament prophets and just men: Aaron, Joshua the son of Nun, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Nathan, David, Ahijah the Shilonite, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Malachi, Zephaniah, Joel, Jonah, Habakkuk, Nahum, Zechariah, Haggai.<sup>2</sup> (f) The proto-deacon and proto-martyr Stephen. (g) Twenty-five martyrs, exclusive of companions and of the forty unnamed martyrs: Erasmus, Theodore, George, Eustratius, Auxentius, Eugenius, Mardarius and Orestes, Panteleemon, Eustathius, Isidore, Æmilian, Adrian, Cæsarius, Julian and his companions, Tryphon, Alexander, Cerycus, Sergius and Bacchus, Cyrus and John, Menas, Victor and Vicentius, the Forty Martyrs. (h) Twenty-one holy women: Thecla, Anastasia, Febronia, Barbara, Juliana, Agatha, Lucia, Callinike, Callista, Julitta, Jerusalem, Katharine, Natalia, Basilissa, Cilicia, Cyriace, Eugenia, Christina, Eirene, Theodote, Fausta. (i) Archbishops, not named, from S. James to Leo and Athanasius. (k) Bishops, not named, from Eneas to Sophronius and John. (l) Fifty-two holy Fathers: Dionysius, Clement, Timothy, Ignatius, Silvester, Irenæus, Alexander,

<sup>1</sup> *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> Why is Moses omitted?

Eustathius, Athanasius, the Basils, the Gregorys, Ambrose, Nicolaus, Amphilochius, Liberius, Damasus, John Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Theophilus, Celestinus, Augustine, the Cyrills, Leo, Proclus, Proclus, Felix, Ormiscus, Agapetus, Eulogius, Martin, Agathon, Sophronius, Polycarp, Flavian, Methodius, Paul, Modestus, Ephraim, Martin, Hesychius, Marcian, Pancras, Antipater, Gregory of Agrigentum, Leo, Euplus, Severian, Philip, Germanus, Nicolaus, Tarasius. (*m*) The holy Fathers, not named, who attended the six General Councils. (*n*) Twenty-two ascetics: Paul, Antony, Paul, Pachomius, Ammon, Theodore, Hilarion, Arsenius, Macar, Macarius, Ephraim, Simeon, Symeon, Euthymius, Theodosius, Sabas, Chariton, Gerasimus, Maximus, Anastasius, Cosmas, John. (*o*) Presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, subdeacons, readers, singers, interpreters, solitaries, not named. (*p*) Faithful kings, naming Constantine and Helena, Theodosius the Great, Marcian, Constantine. (*q*) The faithful laity, not named. (S. pp. 292-300.)

The enumeration of an ever-increasing list of departed worthies must have become very tedious, and we find the lists in later MSS. gradually dwindling, until the use of diptychs entirely died out in the Eastern Church in the fifteenth and in the Western Church in the twelfth century. In lieu of naming the Old Testament and other saints, the Liturgy of S. James, as printed, entreats God for all the orthodox departed, whether named or not named, from the just Abel to the present day. (H. p. 45.) The same shortening of text has occurred in Western Missals. Contrast the long list of a hundred and twelve names, commencing with Abel and ending with local Irish saints, in the Stowe Missal<sup>1</sup>—a Western Missal of the same date as the Messina roll of S. James's Liturgy—with the short 'Commemoratio pro defunctis' in the present Roman Canon:—

'Memento etiam, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum N. et N., qui nos præcesserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis.'

In connexion with this subject we may mention the once common tendency to the more frequent mention of saints by name or in classes, which has been suppressed in later texts. In the *Εὐχὴ ὁρισθᾶμβωνος* in the Rossano Codex of S. James's Liturgy, God's blessing is invoked through the intercession of the Ever-Virgin Mary, S. John the Baptist, S. Stephen, Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, and all saints. (S. p. 324.) This

<sup>1</sup> *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, p. 238.



passage is wanting in the modern text (H. p. 53), which also in another place (H. p. 31) only commemorates the Theotokos, where other classes of saints are named in the older MSS. (S. pp. 234-235.)

Generally speaking, prolixity is a sign of antiquity, and not of modernity as might have been otherwise supposed. The extreme length of the account of the creation and fall of man in the Preface of the Clementine Liturgy, and in the fifth-century fragment of a Coptic Liturgy printed by Georgius (Rome, 1819, p. 310), finds no parallel in later Greek and Æthiopic Liturgies; and the number of prayers and of clauses in Missal Litanies in the Greek Liturgies as at present settled and printed is smaller than in earlier MSS.

(iii.) *Variations effecting improvements on the older MS. Texts.*

It may be merely a question of grammar, such as the substitution of the more classical dative case in a fourteenth century MS. for the accusative case after ἐγχειρεῖν in the earlier MSS.

ἐγχειροῦντας σοὶ τὴν [τῇ] φοβερὰν[α] ταύτην[τη] καὶ ἀναιμακτον[τω] θυσίαν[α]. (Codex Ross. as compared with Paris MS. 2509; S. pp. 258-259.)

Or a question of history, such as the omission in all later MSS. of the astounding assertion made in the earliest extant MS. of S. James's Liturgy that the fifth and sixth General Councils were held at Sinai. (S. p. 296.)

Or a question of common-sense theology. The diptychs of the dead in a twelfth-century MS. of S. Basil's Liturgy commence by mentioning 'the holy bodiless Michael and Gabriel and all the heavenly powers.' (S. p. 82.) A commemoration of the departed, now obsolete, but occurring in the earlier MSS. of S. James's Liturgy at the close of the deacon's Ectene before the Trisagion, enumerated the honourable, glorious, bodiless archangels between the Theotokos and the Baptist. (S. p. 224.) Now, as the angels have never died, there was a manifest absurdity in mentioning them among the departed whose prayers are besought, and in enrolling them by name in the diptychs of the dead. Such insertion must surely have been due in the first instance to accident or to the ignorance of some particular bishop or scribe, and it has been wisely made to disappear in more recent MSS. and printed texts. (H. pp. 28, 118.)

(iv.) *Additions or expansions of language in the modern text.*

This class of alterations consists mainly of the elaboration

of the older and simpler text by the addition of epithets or synonyms, and partly of the addition or insertion of fresh clauses, e.g. :—

τὸ ἅγιόν σου [καὶ ἄχραντον] σῶμα. (S. p. 78. H. p. 101.)

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ [τῇ φοβερᾷ] τῆς ἀνταποδόσεώς σου δικαίας. (S. p. 79; H. p. 104.)

τοὺς ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ πνευμάτων [ἀκαθάρτων] ἐλευθέρωσον. (S. p. 84; H. p. 120.)

μετὰ τούτων καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν [μακαρίων] δυνάμεων. (S. p. 91; H. p. 109.)

ἀναπαυσαμένων [προπατόρων] πατέρων πατριάρχων. (S. p. 92; H. p. 113.)

ἁγίων [ἐνδόξων] καὶ πανευφήμων ἀποστόλων. (S. p. 92; H. p. 115.)

In the above cases the words within brackets have been added in the recent texts, not occurring in the older MSS.

The following MS. passage

ὑπὲρ τῶν προκομισθέντων ἁγίων ἐπουρανίων θείων δώρων (S. p. 303.)

has been expanded in the present text into

ὑπὲρ τῶν προκομισθέντων, καὶ ἁγιασθέντων, τιμίων, ἐπουρανίων ἀρρήτων, ἀχράντων, ἐνδόξων, φοβερῶν, φρικτῶν, θείων, δώρων. (H. p. 46.)

At the end of the deacon's Ektene after the Gospel in S. James's Liturgy an ascription of praise is assigned to the priest in the modern text which does not appear in any of the older MSS.

Σὺ γὰρ εἶ εὐαγγελισμὸς καὶ ὁ φωτισμὸς, σωτὴρ καὶ φύλαξ τῶν ψυχῶν, καὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ὁ μονογενὴς σου Υἱὸς, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ. (H. p. 31; *om.* in S. pp. 234-235.)

It is necessary here to repeat the caution that the mere absence of certain collects or words in older MSS. must not be pressed as always involving their non-existence as part of the Liturgy at the time when a MS. was written. We must be careful to ascertain whether the absence of particular words may not be due to the first class of omissions, referred to above (p. 28). Thus the Triumphal Hymn in the Barberini Codex of St. Chrysostom's Liturgy is introduced with the single word *ἄδοντα* (S. p. 91), but we must not conclude that the remainder of the well-known formula *βοῶντα, κεκραγόντα καὶ λέγοντα* was not in use. It is given in full in the corresponding passage in the Liturgy of S. Basil (S. p. 80). The eight short prayers uttered by the deacon before the Lord's Prayer in the Anaphora of S. Basil (H. p. 126) are not to be

found in the Barberini MS., but are, no doubt, the μέση εὐχή referred to as said by the deacon in the rubric preceding the prayer Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. (S. p. 85.)

(v.) *Variations due to the carelessness or whim of transcribers.*

The following are a sample of a considerable number of various readings, which involve no great significance, and most of which are probably due to accident rather than intention :—

(a) Τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου  
τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. (S. p. 91.)

(b) Τῇ νυκτὶ ἢ παρεδίδου ἑαυτόν  
(S. p. 91.)

(c) Θεὸς ἀληθινός, ἡ πρὸ αἰώνων  
σοφία. (S. p. 80.)

(d) καὶ ποιῆσαι καρπὸν ἀγαθὸν  
ἀνὰ τριάκοντα καὶ ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν.  
(S. p. 14.)

(e) διὰ τὸν ξένον καὶ διὰ τὸν προσή-  
λυτον. (S. p. 38.)

(f) ἀκατάληπτε Θεέ Λόγε. (S. p.  
66.)

(g) ἀνοπτοῖς. (S. p. 236.)

(h) Ἑλεος, εἰρήνη (ix. century :  
S. p. 90.)

(i) Ἑλεος (x. cent. : S. p. 264.)

(k) προσφέρωμέν σοι ἔλεον εἰρή-  
νην θυσίαν αἰνέσεως (xii. century :  
S. p. 264.)

Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ  
ὑμῶν κλωμένον εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν.  
(H. p. 109.)

Τῇ νυκτὶ ἢ παρεδίδου, μᾶλλον δὲ  
αὐτὸν παρεδίδου. (H. p. 109.)

Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς πρὸ αἰώνων, σοφία.  
(H. p. 106.)

καὶ ποιῆσαι καρπὸν ἀγαθὸν ἀνὰ  
τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν. (H. p. 175.)

om. διὰ τὸν ξένον καὶ. (H. p. 182.)

for Θεέ read Θεοῦ. (H. p. 190.)

ἀνθρώποις. (H. p. 31.)

\*Ἑλεον εἰρήνης, θυσίαν αἰνέσεως.  
(H. p. 105.)

\*Ἑλεον εἰρήνης, θυσίαν αἰνέσεως.  
(H. p. 39.)

Προσφέρωμέν σοι ἔλαιον εἰρήνης,  
θυσίαν αἰνέσεως (xiv. century : S. p.  
265) ; προσφέρωμέν σοι ἔλεον εἰρήνης  
θυσίαν αἰνέσεως. (H. p. 39.)

Of the above textual variations, quotations from the Bible, as (a) and (d), deserve to be carefully watched as possibly throwing light upon the text of Holy Writ ; (k) is due to a confusion in the scribe's mind between ἔλαιον and ἔλεος ; (e) is due to confusion caused by homoiocatacrton. The careful student will be able largely to increase this class of variations, which are mostly, however, of no intrinsic importance. Similar variations exist in all ancient MS. texts, and often elsewhere to a greater extent than in Liturgical MSS.

(vi.) *Variations necessitated by lapse of time and change of circumstances.*

Liturgies in their earlier stages abounded in local and personal allusions, and in passages and expressions referring to contemporaneous persons and events, which necessarily became unmeaning and therefore obsolete a few years after they were written. But such passages are of the greatest possible use in enabling us to ascertain the date and locality

of the MS. into which they were introduced, much in the same way that anyone taking up an old Anglican Book of Common Prayer containing intercessions for Queen Anne would assign it to a date between 1702-1714.

These personal and local references have been gradually but entirely removed from modern Liturgies, both Eastern and Western, and the conventional words or symbols, τοῦ δέϊνος, or 'N or M,' have been printed in the text for which the officiating priest has to substitute the name of the chief ruler in Church or State for the time being. Yet, in order to be of use to us in fixing the date of a MS., it is not always necessary that the older form of petition should include a proper name. There is an important expression in the Great Intercession in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, which fixes very closely the date of the Barberini MS. Prayer is there offered ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστοτάτων βασιλέων, τῆς φιλοχρίστου βασιλείας κ.τ.λ. These last three words occur in none of the later MSS., nor in the printed text (H. p. 115). They refer to a period when there was an empress as well as an emperor regnant, and the only period within (palæographically speaking) reasonable limits which presents us with such a state of things is A.D. 780-792, the date of the conjoint rule of Constantine VI. and the Empress Irene. Had Dr. Swainson taken note of this expression, he would have been saved from describing this important MS. throughout his recent volume as 'of the eighth or ninth century.' In a similar way in the Leofric Missal, without the introduction of names, the mention of a king and queen only, and the implication that they are childless—

'Regem nostrum et reginam nostram' (p. lvi.)

'Da de lumbis eius sobolem regnaturam' (p. lvii.)—

point to Leofric's friend and patron, Edward the Confessor and Queen Edith.

But sometimes proper names are introduced, chiefly those of monarchs, patriarchs, bishops, or benefactors, and in such cases, unless the individuals named are obscure, or confusion is possible from there having been more than one person of the same name in a regal dynasty or episcopal succession, the identification of the person and the dating of the MS. are easy and complete.

For example, in the Greek Liturgy translated by Leo Thuscus, the Emperor Alexius is prayed for by name in a MS., which must therefore have been written A.D. 1081-1118 (S. p. 134). A fifteenth-century Greek Liturgy, now in Paris,

18  
co  
mo  
Pa  
14  
Bo  
da  
Sa  
pra  
  
Jol  
at  
pro  
of  
in t  
sad  
Aro  
ens  
or l  
mul  
or e  
in  
Epi  
be e  
Gree  
  
men  
(S. p  
Miss  
dow  
estin  
with  
to id  
no n  
phon  
MS.,  
read  
haps  
wrote  
p. 14  
ality  
Deer  
Miss  
writte  
line 1  
PL

contains a prayer for our most pious and Christ-loving monarchs, John and Mary, referring to the Emperor John Palæologus II. and his third consort, Maria Comnena, 1425-1448 (S. p. 133). Similarly, in the case of Western Service Books, a Missal at Florence (Bibl. Naz. xxxvi. 13) can be dated by a prayer for the Emperor Otho; and an Anglo-Saxon Tropy in the Bodleian Library (MS. 775), by a prayer for King Ethelred.

The mention more than once of 'our most holy Patriarch John' in a fourteenth-century MS. of S. James's Liturgy, now at Paris (Bibl. Nat. MS. 2509: S. pp. 231, 235), probably proves it to be a copy of an earlier MS., written in the time of one of the two Patriarchs of Antioch who bore that name, in the eleventh century, and brought to Europe by the Crusaders or some other travellers. The mention of the orthodox Archbishops Joseph and Orestes connects the Codex Rossanensis with the See of Jerusalem at the close of the tenth, or beginning of the eleventh, centuries. Instances might be multiplied of the dating of MSS. by the aid of archiepiscopal or episcopal names. Some of these names are not recorded in either Le Quien's *Oriens Christianus*, or Gams' *Series Episcoporum*. The lists of bishops in both these works may be enlarged by a careful perusal of published and unpublished Greek Liturgical MSS.

The names of mere monks, nuns, or laity, whether commemorated in a twelfth-century Greek Liturgy of S. Basil (S. p. 83), or in a still earlier Western Office Book (Leofric Missal, p. li.), are generally too obscure to be easily tracked down, and the attempts at their identification, however interesting to the leisurely antiquary, usually cost much labour with very little result. The same must be said of attempts to identify the writers of all such MSS. Sometimes, but by no means always, scribes append their own names in a colophon at the end of a MS., or insert them elsewhere in the MS., generally with the view of securing the prayers of future readers on their own behalf. But it is no easy task—it is perhaps impossible—to identify 'the miserable' Matthew who wrote out S. Chrysostom's Liturgy in the eleventh century (S. p. 143), just as it has not been possible to discover the personality of the Scottish 'wretchock' who wrote the Book of Deer, or of the Irish 'Moel Caich' who wrote the Stowe Missal (p. 243), or of the English Ælfric who claims to have written at least a portion of the Leofric Missal (p. 6, left col. line 14).

Places are more rarely mentioned than persons, but de-

scriptive expressions sometimes occur, which fix with certainty the country in which, or the nation for whom, a Liturgy was written. A tenth-century MS. of S. James's Liturgy contains a petition 'on behalf of Christians who have come and are coming to worship in these holy places of Christ, that they may each have a peaceful, joyful, and speedy return to their own homes' (S. p. 248), which indubitably connects this Liturgy with Palestine. Petitions for rain and for the subsidence of river water in the Liturgy of S. Mark point to Egypt, as the scene of the inundations of the Nile (S. p. 18).

Among the few instances of the occurrence of proper names of countries or places, we may note the mention of Sinai and Raithus in the Codex Rossanensis of S. James's Liturgy. Both these places were subject to the Church of Pharan, with which this MS. is therefore inferred to have been connected. In Western Missals we may instance the mention of a 'regnum Francorum' in the Canon of a Tours Missal in the Bodleian Library (Auct. D. i. 20), of an 'Anglorum rex' and an 'Exoniensium Cathedra' in the Leofric Missal (pp. 20, 205), and of a 'rex Hibernensium' in the Corpus Christi Missal (p. 133). A caution, however, is needed here. Local and personal allusions were sometimes perpetuated by copyists long after they had lost their original appropriateness. Therefore they sometimes prove, not where the MS. in which they actually occur was written, but where the original document was written of which that MS. is a copy.

The assignment of the part usually allotted to a deacon to the archdeacon (as in Paris MS. 2509, whereas the word *διάκονος* is used in the corresponding rubrics in Paris MS. 476), together with frequent intercessions for the most holy Patriarch, prove that a MS. was written for use in a metropolitical church, rather than for any less dignified cathedral or place of worship.

(vii.) *Variations introduced for the sake of giving an air of greater dignity or antiquity to a Liturgy.*

There are not many instances to be adduced as falling under this heading, and fortunately so, for they cannot be passed over as due to the ignorance or carelessness of copyists, but must be charged to the vanity or dishonesty of the clergy or monks attached to some particular rite, and endeavouring to bolster up its antiquity with forged support.

The most notorious instance of this sort is the insertion of the word *ἡμῖν* before *τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις*



twice over in the record of the scene and words of Institution, at the consecration both of the bread and wine in S. James's Liturgy. All the printed editions of that Liturgy, from the *editio princeps* of Morel at Paris in 1560 to the edition of Mr. C. E. Hammond at Oxford in 1877, contain this word. It is also represented in the English translations of Dr. Brett, Bishop Rattray, and Dr. Neale. Many writers have referred to the word as clinching proof of the Apostolic antiquity of this Liturgy. Dr. Neale says: 'The word *ἡμῖν* in this place seems emphatic, and to show that this part of the Canon was composed by one present at the Last Supper' (*Liturgies*, 1868, p. 79). Of course, if this be the case, we may agree with his sentiment expressed elsewhere, that 'Liturgies became at once invested with a dignity and majesty scarcely inferior to that of the New Testament itself' (*Essays on Liturgiology*, p. 412), and we may be ready with Mr. J. E. Field to accept as historical the incredible Syrian tradition that

'On the third day after the descent of the Holy Spirit, the Apostle James celebrated the same Liturgy in every particular which we now possess, and when he was asked whence he had received it he answered thus: "As the Lord liveth, I have neither added anything to, nor taken anything away from, that which I have heard from our Lord." Wherefore this Liturgy is of the very highest excellence, and is first of all.'<sup>1</sup>

An enormous initial difficulty is removed out of the way of our accepting the antecedently improbable theory propounded by Dr. Neale, expanded by Mr. Moultrie, and pushed to the verge of absurdity by Mr. Field, that numerous passages found both in the Greek Liturgies and in the New Testament are quotations in the latter from the former, and not *vice versa*.

Will it, then, be believed that this word *ἡμῖν* does not occur in any of the four extant MSS. of S. James's Liturgy, now published for the first time by Dr. Swainson (pp. 272-3), but that it is an insertion, and evidently a fraudulent insertion, of a copyist named Constantine Palæocappa in the sixteenth century. This person supplied the copy from which Morel printed the *editio princeps* in 1560, and there are the following reasons for suspecting his honesty. (a) He was avowedly writing for a polemical purpose to confute certain Protestant doctrines about the Eucharist, and in order to accomplish

<sup>1</sup> Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient. Coll.* ii. 74; J. E. Field, *Apostolic Liturgy*, p. vii.

this object it was desirable to have the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord's brother in a Liturgy of apparent and undoubted Apostolic antiquity. (b) He nowhere states the title or locality of the MS. of which he made use. We have to be content with such general expressions as 'e mediis Græciæ bibliothecis,' and 'omni studio per litteras conquirere non desii fratris Christi λειτουργίαν.' (c) The text as printed by him has been denuded of all such personal and local references as distinguish the extant MSS. of S. James's Liturgy, and which would have enabled subsequent readers to identify the MS. of which he was making use. (d) Every known MS. omits the important word ἡμῶν which Palæocappa inserts, and inserts the words ἁγίοις, or ἁγίοις καὶ μακαρίοις before αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς, which Palæocappa omits. It is humiliating to think that this fraud of a wily Greek should have imposed upon liturgical students for more than three centuries, and we owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Swainson for exposing it and disposing of it for ever.

We are inclined to catalogue under this head the grotesquely unhistorical assertion, previously alluded to (p. 33), as contained in the Messina roll of this same Liturgy, that the fifth and sixth General Councils were held on Sinai (S. p. 296). Probably an ignorant scribe or ambitious monk thought to enhance the importance of the neighbourhood with which he was connected by representing it to still more ignorant worshippers as having been the scene of those important ecclesiastical assemblies.

The absence of any distinctive title from the earliest MS. copy of the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom (S. p. 88), although two prayers a little lower down are attributed to him, may suggest a doubt as to whether that Liturgy as a whole was originally referred to him. But a solitary omission of such a kind is too slight a foundation to base any certain conclusion upon.

(viii.) *Variations proving or implying an alteration of Ritual.*

A twofold process—one of growth, the other of decay; one of addition, the other of omission—has been gradually going on in the ritual of the Eastern Church, and therefore in the rubrics and wording of her Liturgies as exhibiting and directing that ritual.

Among the more conspicuous instances of omission the following may be pointed out.

(a) The disuse of the diptychs of the living and departed, probably for the sake of brevity, as has been previously suggested (p. 32).

(b) The dismissal, with prayer on their behalf, of the energumens and penitents as well as of the catechumens, before the 'Missa Fidelium.' The preservation of this feature in the Clementine Liturgy is one of the most marked signs of its antiquity. Such dismissal is proved from allusions in S. Chrysostom's writings to have been in force in his time (Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor.), but it is not provided for in the Liturgy which now bears his name, or in any extant form of Greek Liturgy except the Clementine.

(c) The earliest MS. copies of the Liturgies of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom contain a prayer entitled *Εὐχή τῆς ἀνω καθέδρας* or *Εὐχή τῆς καθέδρας τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*. This refers to the Basilican arrangement of churches, long obsolete, with the rarest exceptions, in both Eastern and Western Christendom, in which the chief ecclesiastic present assumed the central and elevated seat in the semicircle of thrones, behind the altar, facing westward.

(d) In one early MS. of S. James's Liturgy, the threefold—not single, as at present—repetition of the Trisagion is immediately followed by an ascription of praise to the Trinity in the form of the 'Gloria Patri,' a variation of usage which does not appear elsewhere. (S. p. 226.)

(e) The printed text of S. James's Liturgy does not exhibit any trace of the exclamation for mercy, thrice repeated in all the MSS., after the reference to the Final Judgment in the Great Oblation. (H. p. 42, and S. pp. 274-275.)

On the other hand the growth of ritual, or at least the appearance in later MSS. and printed texts of elaborate manual and other acts with full rubrics directing their performance is very marked. The consideration of them has led Dr. Swainson to express the hope that one result of his recent book may be to call the attention of the authorities of the Churches of the East to the simpler ritual of earlier years (p. xxxvi.).

It would be impossible within the limits of this article to enumerate all the differences of ritual, as represented by MSS. of the different Greek Liturgies written in different centuries. We must content ourselves with exhibiting roughly in a tabular form the variations appearing at three different periods in a limited portion of a single Liturgy, viz. the pro-anaphoral portion of the Liturgy of Constantinople.

A. 16th Century	B. 11th Century	C. 8th Century
1 Preparation in Vestry, with directions and prayers for vesting	Deest.	Deest.
2 Preparation of paten and chalice in the Prothesis, with piercing of the host and elaborate arrangement of particles	Deest.	Deest.
3 Censing of veils, elements, and Prothesis	Deest.	Deest.
4 Preparation of the Sanctuary with censing of the Holy Table, the Priest, &c., by the deacon, and further ceremonial	Adest.	Deest.
5 Missal Litany	Adest.	Deest.
6 Threefold Introit - Hymn with prayers	Adest.	Adest.
7 Deacon's exclamations and commemoration of Blessed Virgin Mary	Adsunt. Deest. <sup>1</sup>	Desunt. Deest.
8 Little Entrance with its ritual	Adest.	Adest.
9 The Trisagion	Adest.	Adest.
10 Epistle and Gospel	Adsunt.	Desunt.
11 Procession with lights to the ambo, incense, &c.	Desunt.	Desunt.
12 Deacon's Bidding Prayer	Adest. <sup>2</sup>	Deest.
13 Dismissal of catechumens	Adest.	Deest.
14 Cherubic Hymn	Adest.	Adest.
15 Great Entrance with its ritual	Deest.	Deest.
16 Deacon's exclamations and commemoration of Blessed Virgin Mary	Adsunt. Adest. <sup>3</sup>	Desunt. Adest. <sup>3</sup>
17 Kiss of peace	Adest.	Adest.
18 Creed	Adest.	Adest.
19 Removal of veil, fanning of holy gifts, &c.	Desunt.	Desunt.

In this list the Trisagion (9) is marked as present in C, because its presence is indicated by a *Εὐχὴ τοῦ τρισαγίου*, though its words are not given, and there is no rubric ordering it to be sung or said. The Cherubic Hymn (14) is marked as present in C, because its use is indicated in the Liturgy of S. Basil by a prayer to be used by the priest while it is sung, though the wording of it does not occur in the text of either S. Chrysostom's or S. Basil's Liturgy of that date. The Great Entrance is marked as absent in C, because it is not mentioned by name, nor are there any rubrics regulating it. It may be implied in rubrics referring

<sup>1</sup> Excepting the single exclamation *Σοφία ὁρθοί*.

<sup>2</sup> With variations.

<sup>3</sup> Without ritual directions.

to the spreading of the corporal (S. p. 78), and to the holy gifts having been placed upon the Holy Table (S. p. 90).

Now it is obvious, from a perusal of the above list, that we cannot argue that because a hymn, or prayer, or rubric which is found in a sixteenth-century or eleventh-century text is absent from an eighth-century MS., therefore the hymn, or prayer, or ritual in question was non-existent at the earlier date. Omission is not prohibition. Common sense tells us that the clergy must have vested, and that the sacred vessels and elements must have been prepared then as now. Documentary evidence culled from the writings of S. Chrysostom and from other sources assures us that the Gospel and the Epistle were read in the course of the Liturgy, and that the expulsion of catechumens took place at a certain point in the service, although these customs are not hinted at in the Barberini MS. The fact is that neither in the West nor the East did the Missal or Liturgical volume become a complete Service Book till the twelfth century, perhaps in the East not universally till the sixteenth century. The priest in earlier days was largely guided by a traditional and unwritten knowledge of ritual. Separate volumes, such as the *Diakonikon*, the *Typicum*, the *Apostolos*, the *Evangelium*, &c., contained portions of the service or directions which are now embodied in the Missal or *Euchologion*. It would be quite as plausible, but quite as unfair, to argue that certain ritual was not used in the English Church in the eleventh century because there are no rubrical directions for its use in the Leofric Missal (pp. 60-62) as it would be to conclude that the ritual of the Great Entrance is modern because it is not enjoined in eighth- or eleventh-century MSS. Dr. Swainson's appeal, therefore, to the authorities of the Eastern Church does not amount to very much. The date of a ceremony cannot be fixed by the date of the first appearance of a rubric ordering it in a Liturgical MS., but has to be determined by other evidence, which it is by no means, as a general rule, easy to obtain.

Among instances of variety of usage, it may be mentioned that the prayers to be said by the priest while vesting, according to S. Chrysostom's Liturgy, as printed by Goar (*Eucholog.* p. 100), differ from those at present in use (H. p. 82). In the same way the prayers at vesting prescribed in the present Roman Missal differ from the 'Veni, Creator,' ordered in the Sarum Use, and both these again differ from the devotions provided in the still earlier Leofric Missal (p. 59). The confession of faith made by the people in

response to the deacon's invitation, at the close of the Words of Institution in S. James's Liturgy (H. p. 42), occurs in neither of the earlier and only in one of the later MSS. of that rite (S. pp. 274-75), but there are marginal indications of the usage existing, which supply us with another warning against always concluding that prayers or usages at present in vogue, but not mentioned in early texts, were therefore necessarily unknown or unpractised. In another case a short rubric ordering the priest to incline his head after the mention of the All-Holy Spirit in the Epiklesis in S. James's Liturgy, occurs with slight variations in all later MSS. and editions, but is absent from the Messina Roll, where the sign of the cross seems to be substituted for it. (S. pp. 276-77.) Again, a rubric occurs in the Codex Rossanensis ordering the use of the sign of the cross at a point where no similar direction occurs in either earlier or later MSS., or in the printed text. (S. pp. 278-79; H. p. 43.) We should be inclined to infer that it was always used there, but that the traditional observance only found verbal expression in a single instance. Many other such points might be adduced, but we pass on to the last and most important list of

(ix.) *Variations implying, or appearing to imply, growth or alteration of Doctrine.*

(a) The doctrine of the Blessed Trinity seems to be more explicitly stated and defined in later liturgical texts. The present termination of the Lord's Prayer in the Anaphora of S. Basil runs thus:

"Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. (H. p. 126.)

In the eighth century this sentence seems to have ended with the word Πατὸς (S. p. 85) and in the corresponding passage in S. Chrysostom's Liturgy with the word βασιλεία (S. p. 93), unless indeed these are merely abbreviations of the fuller formula of later days. In the concluding clause of a prayer in S. James's Liturgy the theological epithet ὁμοούσιος has been introduced and applied to the Holy Ghost in all the later MSS., whereas it is wanting in the earliest text. (S. pp. 258-95.)

(b) The development of the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary is evidenced by the frequent allusions to and commemorations of her introduced into the Liturgy of modern days. She is mentioned but twice in the eighth-century Liturgy of S. Chrysostom: once at the head of the list of those for whom prayer is offered in the Great Intercession (S.

p. 9  
Thar  
ques  
p. 94  
sam  
holy  
hono  
is co  
thric  
to G  
exhil  
the a  
Map  
a wa  
and  
cond  
Litu  
Swai  
also  
inter  
prese  
tion.  
the a  
favou  
Scrip  
cause  
away  
copy  
addre  
[

A  
found  
more  
seen  
ὑπερ  
the fe  
is enl

1 I  
be her  
was w  
an earl



p. 92); once at the close of a post-communion Collect of Thanksgiving, in which God is besought to grant certain requests through her intercession and that of all the saints (S. p. 94). But she is introduced by name nine times into the same Liturgy in the present day. The second particle of the holy bread is ceremonially arranged on the paten in her honour; she is prayed for still in the Great Intercession; she is commemorated four times, and her intercession is invoked thrice, not directly in prayer to her, but indirectly in prayer to God. The Liturgies of S. James and S. Mark furthermore exhibit in their present form a very abrupt introduction of the angelic salutation, or 'Hail, Mary,'—*Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη Μαρία κ.τ.λ.*—in the middle of the Great Intercession, and in a way so obviously out of harmony with the general structure and intention of the prayer, that it has been conjecturally condemned as an interpolation by modern editors of those Liturgies (H. pp. 45, 183). The MSS. now printed by Dr. Swainson, not only prove that the editors were right, but also throw light upon the extremely curious origin of the interpolation. The words themselves have existed in their present position all along, but in a totally different collocation. They were preceded by an appeal to God 'to remember the archangelic voice which said "Hail thou that art highly favoured, &c.,"' later MSS. adding to the words of Holy Scripture this reason for the Virgin's blessedness, 'because thou didst bear the Saviour of our souls.' By knocking away the opening words enclosed in square brackets, later copyists turned the sentence from an address to God into an address to the Virgin Mary.

[Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῆς ἀρχαγγελικῆς φωνῆς τῆς λεγούσης]  
*Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ· εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξί, καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου, ὅτι σωτήρα ἔτεκες τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.* (S. pp. 40, 290-1).<sup>1</sup>

Another proof of increasing devotion to S. Mary may be found in the growing tendency to apply more numerous and more honourable epithets to her. On S. p. 252 it will be seen that the later MSS. of S. James's Liturgy add the word *ὑπερενδόξου* to the three epithets in earlier employ; and the following sentence from the present Anaphora of S. Basil is enlarged by the addition of the words in brackets from the

<sup>1</sup> In explanation of the texts of S. Mark's Liturgy (S. p. 40) it should be here said that although the Rotulus Vaticanus, as we now have it, was written later than the Codex Rossanensis, it is probably a copy of an earlier but now lost uncial MS.

corresponding sentence in a twelfth-century MS. (H. p. 116 ; S. p. 83):—

ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης,  
[ἐνδόξου] δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου [καὶ ἀειπαρθένου  
Μαρίας].

(c) The language employed with reference to the holy gifts, and still more with reference to our Lord's Eucharistic Presence, becomes less simple and more exaggerated and realistic as time goes on.

In the earlier MSS. of S. James's Liturgy the host is referred to in a post-consecration rubric as τὸν ἄρτον (S. p. 310), but τὸ δῶρον is substituted for τὸν ἄρτον in the present textus receptus (H. p. 49). A string of epithets is now applied in the Deacon's Litany in the same Liturgy to the still unconsecrated gifts. God is besought ὑπὲρ τῶν προκειμένων τιμίων, ἐπουρανίων, ἀρρήτων, ἀχράντων, ἐνδόξων, φοβερῶν, φρικτῶν, θείων δώρων. These epithets can in any case be only interpreted with appropriateness by anticipation, but the difficulty is removed when we find that the clause is wholly absent from the earliest MS. (S. p. 252). A similar clause occurs more appropriately placed in a post-consecration litany in the same Liturgy, but the expansion of language between the tenth century and the present time is very marked.

10th cent. Text (S. p. 302).

Ὑπὲρ τῶν προσκομισθέντων ἁγίων  
ἐπουρανίων θείων δώρων.

Present Text (H. p. 46).

Ὑπὲρ τῶν προσκομισθέντων καὶ  
ἁγιασθέντων τιμίων, ἐπουρανίων,  
ἀρρήτων, ἀχράντων, ἐνδόξων, φοβερῶν,  
φρικτῶν, θείων δώρων.

The Greek Liturgies, in their present form, contain several startling passages of a strongly realistic or materialistic character with reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice. These passages are now proved not to have been originally part of the Liturgy, but to have been imported into it at various dates. All the Eucharistic phrases of ascertained antiquity, strong as some of them may be, point to the spiritual character of the sacrifice and of the Altar Service. The Altar itself, sometimes called *θυσιαστήριον*, either without an epithet (S. p. 222) or with the addition of *τίμιον* (p. 24) or *φοβερόν* καὶ *ἐνδόξον* (p. 22) or *ἅγιον* (p. 77, and frequently) is far more often called *ἡ τράπεζα*, either without an epithet (S. p. 178) or with the addition of *μυστική* (p. 96), *ἐπουράνιος* (p. 322), *παναγία* (p. 4), *λαμπρά* (p. 240), *ιερά* (p. 141), *ιερά καὶ πνευματική* (p. 93), *ἁγία* (p. 175, and frequently). The Altar Service is designated as *φοβερά καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία* (p. 256),

πνε  
(p.  
(p.  
(p.  
καί  
ἄχρ  
(p.  
ἀθά  
μυσ  
(p.  
φρικ  
σωτ  
The  
καί  
τῷ  
—a  
Com  
and  
bloo  
H  
confi  
give  
chos  
Prot  
cuts  
of G  
(θύε  
T  
equiv  
in ac  
Litur  
legal  
gladi  
offeri  
moni  
centu  
In  
the u  
pom  
matic  
‘I  
bling,  
[and  
and to  
preced

116 ;

λένως,  
θένονholy  
christic  
andis re-  
(S. p.  
n the  
ets is  
rgy to  
p τῶν  
δόξων,  
n any  
ation,  
use is  
similar  
eration  
guage  
s very5).  
των καὶ  
υφανίων,  
φοβερῶν,several  
rialistic  
These  
part of  
various  
tiquity,  
aracter  
r itself,  
epithet  
φοβερὸν  
ar more178) or  
p. 322),  
πνευμα-  
Service  
o. 256),

πνευματικὴ καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία (p. 260), λογικὴ λατρεία (p. 80), ἀληθινὴ λατρεία (p. 260), λογικὴ καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία (p. 79), ἁγία καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία (p. 282), θυσία αἰνέσεως (p. 78), ἁγία ἀναφορά (p. 264), θεία λειτουργία (p. 3), κρύβιος καὶ ἐπίφοβος τελετή (p. 220), οὐράνια μυστήρια (p. 260), ἄχραντα μυστήρια (p. 260), ἁγία καὶ ἄχραντα μυστήρια (p. 316), φρικτὰ καὶ ἐπουράνια μυστήρια (p. 85), ἐπουράνια καὶ ἀθάνατα μυστήρια (p. 94), φρικτὸν καὶ ζωοποιὸν καὶ οὐράνιον μυστήριον (p. 30), λατρεία εὐάρεστος, λογικὴ, καὶ ἀναίμακτος (p. 325), ἅγια καὶ ἄχραντα καὶ ἀθάνατα καὶ ζωοποιὰ καὶ φρικτὰ μυστήρια (p. 328), τὸ οἰκονομηθὲν ἡμῖν πρὸς σωτηρίαν μυστήριον (p. 258), ἐφόδιον ζωῆς αἰωνίου (p. 70). The consecrated elements are τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (p. 82). Christ is addressed as Ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθεζόμενος καὶ ὧδε ἡμῖν ἀοράτως συνὼν (p. 94) —a description which, as the Black Rubric in the Book of Common Prayer points out, can only be true of a spiritual and not of a corporal presence of Christ's natural body and blood.

But side by side with such phrases as the above we are confronted with language which it requires a *tour de force* to give a spiritual interpretation to, and which seems purposely chosen to make such a feat impossible: e.g., in the Office of the Prothesis in the Liturgy of Constantinople, when the priest cuts the unconsecrated oblation crosswise, he says: 'The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, is sacrificed (θύεται) for the life and salvation of the world' (H. p. 85).

This can only be explained by considering *θύεται* as equivalent to *οὕτως ἐτίθη*, or by spiritualizing the passage in accordance with the sentiment thus expressed in the Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil: 'Nec enim illud [sacrificium] est sanguinis legalis aut justitiæ corporeæ, sed agnus est spiritalis, gladiusque rationalis et incorporeus in hoc sacrificio quod tibi offerimus' (H. p. 205); but there is no evidence for the ceremonial and its accompanying words earlier than the sixteenth century.

In the Liturgy of S. James, at the Great Entrance, when the unconsecrated elements are being brought in with much pomp and ceremonial, the following 'Εκφώνησις or 'Proclamation' is made by the Deacon:—

'Let all mortal flesh keep silence, and stand with fear and trembling, and ponder nothing earthly in itself, for the King of kings [and Lord of lords] Christ our God cometh forward to be sacrificed and to be given for food to the faithful, and the choirs of the angels precede Him, with every Domination and Power, the many-eyed

Cherubim and the six-winged Seraphim, who cover their faces and shout the hymn Alleluia [Alleluia, Alleluia]' (S. pp. 240-1).

It is difficult—in our opinion, impossible—to defend such language in such a position as this. It sweeps away the ingenious explanations which defend this adoration as anticipatory, or as intended in honour of the priest who bears and not of the elements which are being borne in procession. Therefore it is a consolation to find that there are good grounds for believing that its use is not primitive, as it only occurs in two out of the four extant MSS. of S. James's Liturgy, and as one of the two MSS. from which it is absent is the earliest of them all. (*Ibid.*)

The same passage occurs in S. Basil's Liturgy for use on Easter Eve in a totally different position, after the consecration has been completed by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and before the Communion. This position is unassailable, but the words in themselves are not without difficulties, partly intrinsic, partly created by their new position; and therefore it is again gratifying to find that we cannot get earlier than sixteenth-century evidence for their present use and position in the Liturgy of S. Basil. (S. p. 163.)

Both as regards the procession (*προέρχεται*) and the angelic escort the whole paragraph seems to be a late paraphrase of beautiful and primitive words in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, where the references are both appropriate and intelligible.

'For behold at the present time His spotless body and life-giving blood entering in are about to be laid on this mystic table, invisibly attended by the multitude of the heavenly host; grant to us participation in them without condemnation, in order that by them the eyes of our understanding being enlightened, we may become children of the light and of the day.' (S. p. 96.)

The language now employed at the consignation and intinction in S. James's Liturgy is singularly realistic. When the priest crosses the bread, he says:

'Behold the Lamb of God [the Son of the Father] which taketh away the sins of the world, sacrificed (*σφαγιασθεῖς*) for the life and salvation of the world.'

When he distributes one part to each chalice he says:

'A holy portion of Christ, full of grace and truth, of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, to whom be glory and might for ever and ever.'

And shortly afterwards:

not  
the  
ages

that  
MSS.  
older  
look  
Euch.  
S. T.

T  
toward  
single

'T  
world,  
sin, an  
and n  
eaters,

T  
since  
of alt  
truth.  
κ.τ.λ.  
Hymn  
Σὺ

But th  
Σὺ

And v  
had al  
prayer  
S. Jam  
openin  
tion of  
We  
that th  
VOL.

'O taste and see that the Lord is gracious, He that is broken and not divided, and distributed to the faithful and not consumed, for the remission of sins and eternal life, now, and for ever, and to all ages.'

Of these three passages it has likewise to be remarked that they are only contained in two out of the four extant MSS. of S. James's Liturgy, and that they are wanting in the oldest of them (S. pp. 314-16). The addition to Ps. xxxiv. 8 looks like a late piece of patchwork, added to emphasize Eucharistic doctrine in the spirit of the mediæval hymn of S. Thomas Aquinas:—

A sumente non concisus,  
Non confractus, non divisus,  
Integer accipitur;  
Sumit unus, sumunt mille,  
Quantum isti tantum ille,  
Nec sumptus consumitur.

The same idea is enlarged upon in a prayer later on towards the close of the same Liturgy, but only given in a single MS., and that of the fourteenth century.

'Thou Lamb of God, and Son that takest away the sin of the world, the Calf without blemish, that didst never receive the yoke of sin, and wast willingly sacrificed for our sake, Thou that art broken and not divided, eaten and not consumed, and that hallowest the eaters,' &c. (S. p. 325.)

There is another passage which has undergone alteration since its first known appearance, with the view, not necessarily of altering, but of emphasizing a certain aspect of Eucharistic truth. It occurs near the end of the Prayer, *Οὐδεις ἀξιος κ.τ.λ.* for use by the priest during the singing of the Cherubic Hymn, and in the eighth-century Barberini MS. it runs thus—

Σὺ γὰρ εἰ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος, καὶ ἁγιάζων καὶ ἁγιαζόμενος, Χριστὲ, κ.τ.λ. (S. p. 78.)

But the present text is this—

Σὺ γὰρ εἰ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος, καὶ προσδεχόμενος, καὶ διαδιδόμενος, Χριστὲ, κ.τ.λ. (H. p. 101.)

And we see by a reference to S. p. 123, that this change had already been made in the eleventh century. The same prayer occurs for use in three out of the four MSS. of S. James's Liturgy, but as its use is there indicated by a few opening words only, we get no light thrown upon any variation of text. (S. pp. 242-43.)

We find ourselves unable to follow Dr. Swainson's opinion that the earlier phrase, *ἁγιάζων καὶ ἁγιαζόμενος*, recalls us

to the offering on the first Good Friday, and that the later phrase, *προσδεχόμενος καὶ διαδιδόμενος*, when substituted for it, 'transfers the epoch of the Offering of the Saviour to the epoch of the Reception by Himself of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the distribution of Himself.' (S. p. xlii.) Both phrases refer to the same action of our Lord. Both occur together, as explanatory of each other, not as mutually destructive, in a prayer of incense, early in St. James's Liturgy.

Σὺ γὰρ εἶ μόνος ἅγιος, ὁ ἀγιάζων καὶ ἀγιαζόμενος, προσφέρων τε καὶ προσφερόμενος καὶ τοῖς πιστοῖς μεταδιδόμενος. (S. p. 218.)

This sentence is shortened in a fourteenth-century MS. (S. p. 219), and is shortened still more in the present *textus receptus*. (H. p. 27.) Surely all the above phrases in their varying forms refer with more or less clearness to the ancient Eucharistic truth, that Christ is both priest and victim in the Altar Feast. *Αὐτὸς θύμα, αὐτὸς ἱερεὺς* (Epiphanius, *Hær.* lib. ii. tom. i; *Hær.* lv. § 4); 'Et sacerdos est, ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio.' (Augustin. *De Civit. Dei*, x. 21.)

One further omission perhaps deserves to be noticed. In all the extant MSS. of St. James's Liturgy, the Great Intercession contains a prayer that the divisions of the Churches may cease: *Παῦσον τὰ σχίσματα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν* (S. pp. 286-7); but the phrase has been dropped, as if it was derogatory to the Church of Christ to hint at the existence of schisms within her fold. (H. p. 44.)

Here we must pause, not for want of materials, but for want of space. Several of the subdivisions of this Article, especially (v.), might have been elaborated to almost any length. Numerous points of interest have been passed over, especially with reference to the growth of peculiar ritual: e.g. the infusion of boiling water (in the Constantinopolitan rite) into the consecrated contents of the chalice, a practice so sharply objected to by the Latins, so variously and ingeniously defended by the Greeks. (Goar, *Eucholog.* p. 148.) But enough has been advanced to prove that considerable changes have taken place from time to time in the Greek Liturgies. They have not come down to us unaltered from Apostolic times. They are not to be treated as if they were exempt from the ordinary accidents which befall MSS., or as if every word was sacred. Before an argument is deduced from any passage, the literary history of that passage must be examined into. One cannot but feel some regret that so eminent a student of Eastern Liturgies as the late Dr. Neale has not been spared to see the publication of Dr.

Sw  
idea  
the  
adv  
'Te  
the  
conj  
the  
itself  
has b  
expa

AN

The

It is  
lectu  
tion  
any r  
and th  
the C  
ardent  
surpris  
definit  
each o  
childre  
presen  
Divine  
many t  
scientif  
a progr  
blem a  
rest of  
as a b

<sup>1</sup> An  
effect tha  
and othe  
developm



Swainson's last volume. If it dashes in pieces some lofty ideals of the unchanging character of the Service Books of the Eastern Church; if it demolishes some of the arguments advanced by recent Liturgiologists on the strength of the 'Textus ad normam hodie acceptam,' it nevertheless clears the atmosphere, and assures us of what we ought all to have conjectured beforehand, that, as in the case of the Liturgies of the Western Church, and as in the case of Holy Scripture itself, only to a far greater degree, the text of Greek Liturgies has been subjected from time to time to variations, corruptions, expansions, omissions, and interpolations.

---

### ART. III.—RELIGION AND SCIENCE: BISHOP TEMPLE'S BAMPTON LECTURES.

*The Relations between Religion and Science.* The Bampton Lectures for 1884. By the Right Rev. FREDERICK, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER. (London, 1885.)

IT is a recognized fact that a formidable portion of the intellectual obstacles to religion is based on the supposed opposition between theology and science. That there cannot be any real opposition between the verities of the Christian faith and those of science, between God's revelation of Himself in the Church and His revelation of Himself in nature, the most ardent believer is ready to acknowledge. But it is not at all surprising that our partial glimpses of truth or our imperfect definitions of it should be sometimes difficult to reconcile with each other. For example, it is easy to see how the fact that children suffer in consequence of their parents' sins may be so presented as to conflict with an exalted *à priori* idea of Divine justice. Or—to take an example which perplexes many thoughtful minds at the present time—if we accept the scientific doctrine that the human race is the highest term of a progressive evolution from the lowest form of life, the problem arises how man came to be so differentiated from the rest of the animal world as to be capable of being described as a being made 'in the image of God.'<sup>1</sup> This is one of

<sup>1</sup> An ingenious suggestion is put forward by Bishop Temple to the effect that instead of man's sharing a long line of descent with monkeys and other vertebrates, his organism is the product of a special line of development which branched off at a very early period and in the course

a large class of difficulties which have been brought into especial prominence by the scientific progress of the century. The difficulty in these cases arises from the idea that the religious view necessarily involves the breach of a definite, settled, and ascertained uniformity of nature. A demonstrated certainty of science is imagined to be in opposition to the unproved beliefs of religion.

Many of the points supposed to be at issue between science and religion have been handled from time to time in these pages. Considering, however, the importance of the subject and the serious nature of the stumbling-block presented to many minds by what appear to us to be misapprehensions, we welcome the opportunity afforded by the publication of Bishop Temple's *Bampton Lectures* for offering some remarks upon the general question.

We must, however, preface those remarks with our hearty congratulations to the diocese of London on the appointment of Bishop Temple to preside over it. His indefatigable energy in the office of a bishop has been exhibited in the diocese which has lost him, while his thorough grasp of the intellectual difficulties of the day is clearly proved by the volume before us. It needs not to be argued how urgently the first of these qualifications is required, and how desirable is the second, in the occupant of the see of London.

Attempts have been made in recent years, by representative men on both sides, so to mark out the provinces of religion and science as to prevent the possibility of any conflict between the two. On the one hand the votary of science, while declaring that he alone is in possession of real knowledge, allows sometimes the importance of religion as furnishing an ideal of conduct, without which any system of education would be defective. He admits the subjective value of religion, or at least of some of the elements of religion. He acknowledges, for example, the elevating and purifying influence of the study of the life and character of our Lord. But, according to him, religious beliefs are nothing more than an imaginative presentment of the facts of life portrayed upon an imaginative background. They are mere creations of the mind, and consequently cannot possibly conflict with the substantial certainties of science.

On the other hand, there have been defenders of religion who, while maintaining the equal validity of religious and scientific truth, have imagined that a short and easy solution of the of which it was rendered fit to be that of the rational head of the terrestrial creation.

1885  
diffi  
mat  
Acc  
relig  
Reli  
spher  
main  
the n  
them  
that  
the n  
has  
prop  
V  
modu  
theor  
T  
ideas  
it is  
tion c  
not b  
ideas  
marsh  
the ce  
been  
upon  
Deferr  
mainta  
religio  
But wi  
legend  
by som  
the ba  
moral  
moral,  
would  
as furn  
grantin  
ideal m  
still re  
force of  
regard  
compar  
time by  
could be

difficulties might be found in the assertion that the subject-matter of religion is quite different from that of science. According to this view the man of science and the man of religion have not really stood face to face on common ground. Religion and science are said to be occupied with separate spheres of thought. Accordingly, one writer on this side has maintained that the dogmas of faith are above and beyond the reach of science, so that she can neither prove nor disprove them; while another writer, arguing from the undoubted fact that religious considerations are left entirely out of sight when the mathematician is investigating the properties of a curve, has declared that while science is not 'atheistic' it might properly be called 'atheous.'

We cannot regard either of these attempts to provide a *modus vivendi* for religion by the side of science as either theoretically sound or likely to be practically useful.

That the theory which denies objective validity to religious ideas cannot possibly be accepted by the defenders of religion it is scarcely necessary to say. It is a fundamental contention on their part that the truths of religion *are* truths, and not baseless visions; and, under the conviction that religious ideas represent the most solemn realities, their aim is so to marshal the evidence that the inquiring Christian may 'know the certainty (*τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*) of those things' wherein he has been instructed. In short, religion, according to them, rests upon a foundation no whit less solid than science does. Deferring for the moment all argument on this point, we maintain that if this position were surrendered the so-called religion which would remain would have no practical value. But what would remain? Is it quite clear that the 'Catholic legend,' as the Christian creed would then be styled, as indeed by some anti-Christian writers it is already styled, would form the basis of the authorized or the fashionable instruction in moral duty? It is notorious that there are in our day social, moral, and political movements some of whose promoters would be far from willing to accept the New Testament as furnishing a perfect standard of human conduct. But, even granting that the commanding excellence of the Christian ideal must assure it at least pre-eminent rank, the question still remains what the practical value, what the constraining force of the Gospel narrative would be when it should be regarded as mythical. To form an estimate of this we must compare it with the constraining force exerted at the present time by some acknowledged legend. The difference, if any, could be only in regard to degree. In regard to kind there

would be no difference; for any influence arising from the thought of Divine Power or Will must be considered to have vanished from both alike. A legend, however beautiful, is after all a legend, and nothing more. Nor do we see how there would be any difference in degree. Zero multiplied even by infinity is still zero; and if the force of even the most beautiful of pagan legends is absolutely *nil*, if the endurance of Prometheus on behalf of man, if the courage of Hercules, is powerless to influence human conduct, why should it be otherwise with the self-sacrifice of the Divine Son of man? We do know, let it be remembered, how powerful an influence for good has been exerted during eighteen centuries by the Christian creed accepted as true. We do know how the belief in the Divine Redeemer as, to quote Bishop Temple's words, 'a living present power, able to give strength and victory in the conflicts of the soul,' has transformed individuals, and through them society. But if the cause cease to act it is a scientific principle that the effect will be looked for in vain.

Perhaps, however, it may be contended that the life of Christ must needs exercise the sort of influence that attaches to the biography of any exceedingly good and unselfish man. The contention may be readily granted, but only with the proviso that the character of Christ as drawn by the Evangelists is substantially true. We cannot stop to question how far this admission would be consistent with the negations on which rests the theory under discussion. It is, however, scarcely to be denied that the enthusiasm of the first preachers of Christianity is absolutely inexplicable unless that proviso be granted. However reluctant men may be to admit the historic truth of the supernatural element in the Gospel, however ingenious may be the attempts to discredit the authenticity of the New Testament writings (we remark by the way that such attempts have not hitherto met with much success), yet the spread of Christianity must assuredly be traced back to the undying zeal of a few men who had caught one and the same spirit from one and the same source. To take the lowest ground, the courage of these men, their ardent love for mankind, their devotion to duty, their martyrdom, testify to the supreme excellence of One whom they had personally known, to the attractive beauty of His character whom they acknowledged as their Master. It is, in fact, not more certain that Julius Cæsar existed, and that he was a skillful and successful commander, than that Jesus of Nazareth existed and was known by a circle of intimate friends as an example of

the  
tow

faith  
rests  
that  
to g  
evid  
is im  
was  
pers  
be in  
bour  
Chri  
Poss  
that  
Thus  
Lord  
powe

have  
know  
is not  
misce  
Him,  
ascrib  
calles  
we de  
that  
And i  
becom  
we can

Or, m

'T  
it imp

It  
our Bl  
we ha  
atten  
infer  
in our  
for ou

<sup>1</sup> So  
Supern  
<sup>2</sup> *It*

the most absolute devotion towards God, of the tenderest love towards men, and of the most spotless sincerity.

The proviso, then, that the Gospels contain at least a faithful and trustworthy portrait of the founder of Christianity rests upon the solid ground of fact; and we are not aware that any but the most extravagant of disputants are disposed to gainsay it. We have dwelt upon the point because the evidential value of this seeming truism is very striking. It is impossible to stop short at the admission that Jesus Christ was devout and sincere, One who deserved and won the personal devotion of His followers, One whom they knew to be incapable of deceit. He who admits thus much is at least bound to listen with some deference to the claim of Jesus Christ to be the Bearer of a Divine mission and to be the Possessor of Divine power. The bearings of the argument on that claim are forcibly and clearly stated by Bishop Temple. Thus, with regard to miracles, after asserting the fact that our Lord was universally believed by His disciples to possess the power of working them, he proceeds—

'There is no hint of any disclaimer on His part. He must have known whether He could work miracles or not. He must have known that His disciples believed Him to possess the power. There is not the slightest trace of His ever having implied that this was a misconception. He did sometimes disclaim what was ascribed to Him, even when what was ascribed to Him was truly His, but was ascribed to Him without real knowledge of what it implied. "Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but One—that is, God" we do find; but "Why askest thou Me to do this? There is none that can do this but One—that is, God" we do NOT find. . . . And if He claimed to possess and exercise this power, the evidence becomes the evidence of One who must have known and whom we cannot disbelieve.'<sup>1</sup>

Or, more concisely and more generally, a little further on—

'The character of our Lord as revealed in the Gospels makes it impossible to disbelieve His claims, whatever they may be.'<sup>2</sup>

It will be seen that the demand for assent to the claims of our Blessed Lord is made absolute by Bishop Temple, whereas we have so far urged no more than a demand for respectful attention to those claims. It is not, however, that the Bishop's inference appears to us to be unwarranted, but that at this stage in our own argument the more moderate demand is sufficient for our purpose. It is better to understate the case than to

<sup>1</sup> See Lecture VII., 'Apparent Collision of Science with the Claim to Supernatural Power,' *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 208, 209.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 212.

appear to overstate it. When due weight is given to other considerations about to be advanced, some of which are suggested by the volume before us, it will be seen that the argument based upon our Blessed Lord's character is invested with overwhelming force.

That this argument by itself is not in our day irresistible is clear from the fact that it is resisted. It is, of course, resisted, as it always has been, by those who are insensible to moral excellence. One characteristic of religion, as will be proved shortly, is that it appeals primarily to the moral sense. In this faculty begins for the individual God's revelation of Himself and of His Will, and our Blessed Lord declares that only in doing God's Will, so far as it is already known, a man becomes qualified to test the Divine character of the Christian revelation. Nothing will convince those who are morally blind. 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.' 'If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them which are lost.'

It is not, however, with the moral hindrances to religion that we are now concerned. Nor, though a tone of contemptuous profanity is said to be on the increase among the younger men of our day, is this the direct echo of the prevailing tone of modern literature. In this, for the most part, nothing can be more respectful, nothing more appreciative, than the language in which Christianity and its Founder are spoken of. Indeed, short of their acceptance no higher compliment, if the term is permissible, can be paid to Him than that satire and contempt should be reserved, as they mostly are, for persons who profess but do not carry out the Christian rule.

It would be too much to assert even that the earliest preachers of Christianity attributed all the opposition which they encountered to moral defects in their opponents. Assuredly it would be the height of injustice to make such an accusation at the present time. Assuredly there is many an earnest seeker after truth, 'perplexed in faith but pure in deeds,' who deprives himself of the happiness of a definite religious belief from the feeling that it is above all things necessary to be honest with himself. To such a one it seems that in these latter days a revolution has taken place in the relation of religious ideas to secular knowledge. In former times men might naturally admit the hopelessness of turning elsewhere but to Christ for 'the words of eternal life.' Already accepting as almost a necessary truth that God had opened a channel of revelation to mankind, and that only in following



the Divine guidance would man arrive at the perfection of his own being, they had but to satisfy themselves on the single point whether Jesus Christ was indeed the consummation of that revelation. But now the fundamental proposition seems involved in difficulty and doubt. Religious ideas and scientific knowledge, it is said, are mutually incompatible. In a word, eternal life, revelation, even the existence of God Himself, are called in question, or even denied.

To such an inquirer the considerations methodically arranged and powerfully stated in Bishop Temple's *Bampton Lectures* cannot fail to be of use. But we have now to show the fallacy of the second theory mentioned above, that which seeks to guard religion from conflict with science by claiming for it a totally separate sphere above and beyond science.

This theory would probably never have received so much countenance as it has if it did not contain an element of truth. But the question whether the theory as a whole is true turns upon the way in which science is defined. Religion, it is sometimes said, begins where science leaves off; and this may be admitted to be true if the term science (mathematics apart) be restricted to the ascertained facts of the order of the physical universe. Though science can furnish no explanation of the origin of the universe, or of the essential nature of causation, yet, the universe, in some condition or other, being granted, and causation being granted, it is able to construct, without reference to any theological idea, such explanations of phenomena, such sequences of causes and effects, as compel the assent of our intelligence. It is no narrow domain that is thus reserved for science, nor is her sway in it disputed by reasonable men. In some of its provinces she is able to prove the completeness of her conquest by the power of prediction. The astronomer, for example, announces that on a certain day, at a certain hour, the shadow, at other times invisible, of the earth will be seen to creep over the surface of the moon; and his prediction is fulfilled. In short, by patient investigation scientific men have succeeded in registering a vast number of the so-called laws of nature, and in the mere statement of these laws men of any or of no religion meet on common ground.

If this were all that is ordinarily meant by science no conflict, or no lasting conflict, would, or at any rate ought to, arise between it and religion. Religion, rightly understood, must in fact welcome any fuller revelation of the grandeur, the beauty, and the order of creation. The religious man ought humbly to accept all ascertained facts, how contrary soever

they may appear to his preconceived ideas. That his thoughts are not God's thoughts he has been taught on what he believes to be Divine authority. Religious men have not indeed always been able to divest themselves of prejudice, and there is some ground for the assertion that the apparent hostility which they have encountered from the men of science has been in a measure due to a desire on the part of some of the latter to purify and elevate current conceptions of nature, and even of the Power behind nature. But we must not pursue this line of thought.

Beyond the region of certain and indisputable fact lies the vast region of probability,<sup>1</sup> and it is to the latter that some of the grandest scientific conclusions and some of the most useful principles or guiding lines of scientific investigation belong. As examples may be specified the principle, universally adopted, of the uniformity of nature; the doctrine, held by the best authorities to have been scientifically established, that all life proceeds from antecedent life; and the theory of the evolution of existing from earlier species. Are such ideas to be classed under the head of science? There is certainly no other generally accepted term for them. But if they are to be so classed, then it is not only religion that starts, if we grant that it does so start, where science in the restricted sense comes to an end. Science itself in the wider sense, as the attempt to furnish a connected account of the universe, travels far beyond the bounds of demonstrated truth.

Now it is futile to deny that, in this region of probable science, ideas are met with which conflict sometimes really, sometimes only in appearance, with religious truth. The religious man believes that God created and rules the world; that He has endowed man with the capacity to know His Will; that man is accountable to his Maker for the use which he makes of that capacity; that Divine Providence has so ordered the course of this world's history as to train and prepare mankind for a higher state of being; that God hears and answers prayer; that, in a word, He guides with His counsel here those who seek His guidance, and that He will afterwards receive them into glory. It is impossible to reconcile these beliefs with the doctrine that mechanical forces alone have

<sup>1</sup> The term probability is here employed with the wide latitude of meaning asserted for probable evidence by Bishop Butler in the opening sentence of his great work: 'Probable evidence,' he says, 'is essentially distinguished from demonstrative by this, that it admits of degrees, and of all variety of them, from the highest moral certainty to the very lowest presumption.'

produced the varied universe ; or that man is a mere product of natural selection ; or that no purpose is visible in nature or in history ; or that conscience is nothing more than a hereditary sensitiveness to what benefits or injures the human community ; or that consciousness is for ever extinguished at death—that 'man dies, nor is there hope in dust.' Yet these doctrines are put forward in the name of science.

It has now been shown on the one hand that religion cannot, under pain of extinction, accept the description of itself as a product of the imagination ; and, on the other hand, that, since religion and science undoubtedly deal to some extent with the same subject-matter, there is no escape from the liability of conflict between them. For him, then, who would act the part of the mutual friend of both, the task is clear. He must show that religious belief rests upon a firm foundation of such a character as is suitable to the nature of religion itself. When the commanding and independent position of religion is once recognized, it will be felt that there can be no real contradiction between scientific truth and religious truth ; and though a solution of all difficulties may not at once be achieved, yet it will often be possible to show that apparent opposition arises either from reluctance on the part of religious teachers to accept the new light which science casts upon the works of God, or from unwarranted conclusions put forth in the name of science.

The second of these points, viz. the hostility of religious teachers to new scientific light, is one that calls for very little remark, even if we had ample space at command. But it seems worth while to point out that the inevitable and salutary opposition which new theories encounter is not continued in England by representative religious men after it has ceased among scientists themselves. The reception which the doctrine of evolution has met with is decisive of this point. Though that doctrine was of the most startling character, and though it must be classed with the conclusions which are probable only and incapable of actual demonstration, yet all intelligent religious teachers have shown readiness to weigh the evidence in its favour, and many have expressed their belief of its truth.

In the remainder of this paper, which will be devoted to illustrating the first and the last of the points mentioned, we shall borrow freely from Bishop Temple. His first two lectures deal with the origin and nature of scientific and religious belief respectively, and it is argued with much force that both have the same subjective starting-point in our being,

however they differ in development and aim. To quote from the concluding part of the second lecture—

‘This account of the fundamental beliefs of Religion as compared with the fundamental postulates of Science shows that the two begin with the same part of our nature, but proceed by opposite methods. Both begin with the human will as possessing a permanent identity and exerting a force of its own. But from this point they separate. Science rests on phenomena observed by the senses, Religion on the voice that speaks directly from the other world.’<sup>1</sup>

If man were not an agent, and conscious of personal identity surviving change, there would be no science ; if he were not a moral agent there would be no religion. He is an agent. He is conscious of acting as a cause. He has a sense of power as belonging to himself, the power of determining events. The experience that his power has limits—that is to say, the experience of resistance—gives him the consciousness of power or force external to himself. In the infancy of thought all exhibitions of external force—in other words, all examples of motion—are attributed to the action of will, are supposed to proceed from persons. ‘A secret will moves the wind, the sun, the moon, the stars, and each is independent of the others.’<sup>2</sup> Soon the notion of the transmission of force grows up. It is recognized that force may be communicated from one thing to another, and yet to another. Thus there arises a distinction between the notion of the self-originated action of persons and the notion of transmitted or derivative action. Experience observes regularity in the latter, and thus we obtain the notion of laws of nature. But the belief in the stability of these laws involves the assumption of something permanent underlying phenomena, and this assumption comes from the consciousness of our own permanent identity.

The argument which we have just presented in summary appears to us very able and convincing. It forms, however, the most abstruse portion of the volume before us, and naturally the difficulty of following it is not likely to be lessened by condensation. The substance of it may perhaps be stated to be that Science is not a mere register of facts, but also a statement of beliefs, to the form of which beliefs we are impelled by certain elements of consciousness, viz. the sense of personal identity, and the sense of power in the will to act upon the world. Before we touch upon the connexion of the same elements of consciousness with religion we cannot forbear to introduce two inferences from the foregoing account of

<sup>1</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 22.

the origin of science. The first is drawn by the Bishop himself, in order to show that though the postulate of the uniformity of Nature continually receives fresh confirmation from experience, yet it cannot be used to prove that miracles never happen. We venture to add that the same inference lightens many other difficulties, including the one stated at the close of our opening paragraph. We quote the Bishop's words in reference to the belief in the uniformity of Nature :—

‘If the origin of this belief be what I have described, it is perfectly clear that, however vast may be the evidence to prove this uniformity, the conclusion can never go beyond the limits of this evidence, and generality can never be confounded with universality. The certainty that Nature is uniform is not at all, and never can be, a certainty of the same kind as the certainty that four times five are twenty.’<sup>1</sup>

For the other inference we are ourselves responsible. Assaults have been made by Hume and his disciples in the name of philosophy and science both upon the belief in the reality of the permanent self and upon the belief in the causative power of the will. It has been argued with much ingenuity that each of these beliefs is a delusion. When, however, we inquire closely what elements of our consciousness lie at the very base of the whole structure of science, it is in these same beliefs that we are led to find the answer. Clearly, then, if that answer is, as it appears to be, correct, the attempt to deny the truthfulness of those elements of consciousness is in effect an attempt to destroy the foundations of science. And this, in fact, it has proved to be. For, to touch only on one point, the denial that man can act as a cause has led to the denial that we can assert causation at all, and the substitution of the idea of invariable sequence instead. But if we had never known such a thing as causation, causation would be a meaningless term, or at the best a conception representing nothing ; and it would be impossible to account for the origin of the term if it have no meaning, or of the conception if there be no reality within or without us to suggest it.

But to resume. If for the purposes of science these impressions of the permanent self and of the power of will have any value, they have the same value for the purposes of religion. Religion starts in man from the sense of his personality as centred in his will, and from the conviction that he has power, whatever its limits, to give effect to his will. But whereas science has to do with the phenomena presented to

<sup>1</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, p. 28.

experience, religion has to do with duties recognized by, or, to speak more comprehensively, with the commands of, the Moral Sense. In the Moral Sense or conscience the stronghold of religion has been seen to consist by all the ablest modern champions of faith. 'It is the will,' as Bishop Temple says, 'that makes us responsible beings.' But, 'besides the power of willing, we have the power of recognizing spiritual truth. And this power or faculty we commonly call the conscience.' But we must quote in full the eloquent passage in which the action of the conscience is summed up:—

'It is, then, to the man thus capable of appreciating a law superior in its nature to all phenomena, and bearing within himself the conviction of a personal identity underlying all the changes that may be encountered and endured, that is revealed from within the command to live for a moral purpose, and believe in the ultimate supremacy of the moral over the physical. The voice within gives this command in two forms; it commands our duty and it commands our faith. The voice gives no proof, appeals to no evidence, but speaks as having a right to command, and requires our obedience by virtue of its own inherent superiority.'<sup>1</sup>

The conscience is the ultimate authority. In the last resort it gives no proof of its right to command, offers no credentials. Yet this is not to say that the individual conscience is an infallible judge, capable of determining on the instant all questions brought before it. When in our courts of justice a case presents itself involving an unfamiliar issue, even the most learned and skilful judges require the aid of counsel to understand the bearings of the law upon it. And the consciences of men, whether as a race or as individuals, have required and require enlightenment. The race has gained it partly by the natural operation of the rational faculties, but largely, or so religious men believe, by direct gift from Heaven in the way of revelation. Individuals gain it partly by instruction, the instruction of precept and example, partly, or so religious men believe, by Divine illumination. When once, however, the conscience has spoken there is no appeal to any other authority than itself. Only from the decree of the less enlightened conscience to the same conscience when more fully enlightened is there an appeal.<sup>2</sup>

Now the man who recognizes the absolute authority of the Moral Law which conscience imposes upon him will recognize

<sup>1</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> The example of S. Paul is to the point. As the persecutor of Christians and as the Apostle of Christ he was equally under the dominion of conscience. See Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 9, xxvi. 16; 2 Cor. i. 12, &c.



also the binding nature of that law as universal. That its application may vary in detail according to differences in the relations of individuals is too obvious to need illustration; but in its essence that law is immutable, eternal, necessary, universal. We welcome the words of Bishop Temple on this head:—

‘The Moral Law in its own nature admits of no exceptions. If a principle of action be derived from this law it has nothing to do with time, or place, or circumstances; it must hold good in the distant future, in planets or stars utterly remote, as fully as it holds good now and here.’<sup>1</sup>

The universal supremacy of the Moral Law constitutes, and rightly constitutes, the foundation stone of the Bishop's argument. ‘In our very conception of a moral supremacy is involved,’ he argues, ‘the conception of an intended supremacy.’ Thus the characteristics of the Moral Law lead us to the Eternal Throne itself. In the Bishop's words—

‘The Moral Law in its government of the world reveals itself as possessing the distinctive mark of personality—that is, a purpose and a will. And thus as we ponder it this Eternal Law is shown to be the very Eternal Himself, the Almighty God.’<sup>2</sup>

And again—

‘We dare not let go the truth that the holiness, the justice, the goodness, the righteousness, which the Eternal Moral Law imposes on us as a supreme command are identical in essential substance in our minds and in His. Indeed, the more we keep before us the true character of that law, the more clearly do we see that the Moral Law is not His command, but His nature. He does not make that law. He is that law. . . . To believe that the rule of duty is supreme over all the universe is the first stage of faith. To believe in Almighty God is the last and highest.’<sup>3</sup>

Bishop Temple's views as to the essential nature of faith are in accordance, we believe, with what we have said ourselves in a previous number of this Review:—‘The *fides quæ creditur* is, before all else, the personal laying hold, by the soul, of the One Personal Good, who is set before it in the *fides quæ creditur*.’<sup>4</sup>

The Bishop hardly condescends to argue with that modern school of scientific moralists which rejects the foregoing views of the Moral Law. He declares, indeed, that they have not

<sup>1</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 58, 59.

<sup>4</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. x. p. 544.

succeeded in accounting by natural causes for the strictly spiritual element in religion, nor for the feelings with which we regard the Moral Law. And he asserts that

'to bring the Moral Law under the dominion of Science, and to treat the belief in it as nothing more than one of the phenomena of human nature, it is necessary to treat the sentiment of reverence which it excites, the remorse which follows on 'disobedience to its commands, the sense of its supremacy, as delusions. It is always possible,' he continues, 'so to treat these things, but only at the cost of standing lower in the scale of being.'<sup>1</sup>

With these statements, and others of like nature contained in a subsequent lecture,<sup>2</sup> we entirely concur; but we cannot help thinking that something more than statement was needed here. The doctrine of the Moral Sense, which Bishop Temple follows Butler and Kant in upholding, is, as we have said and as has just been shown, the stronghold of religion. It is not surprising, therefore, to find it just now the object of determined assaults. The defence of this all-important position is certainly a work that is called for in view of modern scientific ideas, although of course it cannot take the form of a direct demonstration of axiomatic truth.

Not with the idea of instructing the Bishop, but in order to give some completeness to this portion of the present essay we venture to remark briefly on the point before us. It is maintained by some writers—for example, by Mr. Leslie Stephen—that all our moral ideas and sentiments are due simply and entirely to the interaction of the forces of the social organism, that they are merely instances of the 'survival of the fittest'—by the 'fittest' being understood, not what is the nearest approximation to an absolutely perfect ideal, but what is most beneficial to the vitality of the social organism. If this doctrine were true it would follow that it is only by a kind of accident that justice, mercy, benevolence, truthfulness, are accounted and felt by us to be admirable qualities. Had the conditions of existence been different, as they might very well have been on the supposition that no will or purpose rules the world, the very opposites of the qualities named might have commanded our admiration and imposed themselves upon our consciences. In some other planet injustice, cruelty, and lying may wear the diadem as virtues. From this conclusion, which to our mind is an example of *reductio ad absurdum*, there is no escape for those who deny that, because

<sup>1</sup> See *Rampton Lectures*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 177-180.

righteousness is at the very centre of the system of the universe, it is *therefore* reflected, however dimly, in the heart of the rational finite being. Nor does Mr. Stephen attempt to escape from it; on the contrary he boldly proclaims his belief in it. If any reject it he meets them with his favourite weapon in dealing with what concerns religion—a sneer. He taunts them with professing omniscience. We quote his words :—

‘ We cannot mean by eternity or immutability that the Moral Law will remain unaltered even if the conditions upon which it depends be altered ; but only that these are the most fundamental conditions assignable, the permanent conditions of social vitality, which remain constant through an indefinite series of more superficial changes in the social organism. If we assume that these conditions may be entirely different in some different world, the morality in that world would presumably be also different. If in some distant planet lying were as essential to human (!) welfare as truthfulness is in this world, falsehood might there be a cardinal virtue. The possibility of such a state of things may be denied by those at least who profess omniscience ; but if you admit the possibility of such a change you must admit also the possibility of the correlative change in the morality.’<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Stephen's sneer is entirely misdirected. The foundation of his system is the conviction that everything in the world, whether physical or moral, can be explained as a product of evolution by natural causes. The foundation of the system which he opposes is the conviction that right is right, goodness is goodness, absolutely and intrinsically. Which of these two convictions savours most of the pretension to omniscience may be left to the reader to decide. This, however, may be asserted without fear of contradiction : no evidence that is likely to be obtained for evolution can ever produce a conviction of its truth worthy to be compared in strength with the conviction with which the truth of some at least of the elementary principles of morals is held by the generality of mankind—may we not say even by Mr. Stephen himself? Where is the reasonableness, then, either of the attempt to establish accepted moral axioms by means of the scientific doctrine of evolution, which in regard to organic development is only a probable hypothesis, and in regard to mind and morals must for ever leave much unexplained, or of the attempt to degrade these axioms from their commanding height as axioms by means of the same scientific doctrine which in regard to certainty is immeasurably below them ?

<sup>1</sup> See *The Science of Ethics*, pp. 153, 154 (London, 1882).  
VOL. XX.—NO. XXXIX.      F

It is easy enough to state such cases as we meet with in books of casuistry, cases in which duty seems to consist in violating some recognized moral principle.<sup>1</sup> But does this prove that the Moral Law itself is essentially variable? Quite the contrary. For whatever the solution of the given case may be, it professes to be based upon the fundamental law of duty, and to justify itself, if an exception, either as being an exception which proves the rule, or as the setting aside of a narrower in order to preserve intact a wider rule. Again, it is easy enough to select some rule of morality that applies only to the present conditions of existence, such, for example, as those that concern the relations of sex, and to assert with an air of triumph that the eternity of the Moral Law is disproved by these examples. But is it so? Nay, for, to make no account of the possibility that in these matters a corresponding spiritual reality may be symbolized, the evolutionary moralist himself deduces his own regulations of them from general principles. Thus even exceptional cases and provisions that apply only to terrestrial existence point towards the conclusion which represents the deepest conviction of the human heart.

This conviction is that in its essence the Moral Law is eternal, immutable, universal; whence it follows, as we have seen, by a necessary step that it is Divine. On this rock, the eternity of the Moral Law and our innate conviction of it, religion is built. And has science any surer foundation, or was not the Apostle right after all when he declared the reverse? Science, according to the ablest of its professors, is but a knowledge of existing relations—is but a knowledge of phenomena. But the Moral Sense has cognizance of that which will outlast phenomena, which will therefore outlast the knowledge of phenomena. The essence of the Moral Law is love, and love is the essence of the Eternal God. To deny the latter is to fall into the dreary gulf of pessimism. To the deniers of it no less than to the Apostle of love the whole world lieth in evil. Well; then, may we proclaim with S. Paul, 'Love never faileth; but . . . whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.'<sup>2</sup>

It is in the light of the supremacy of the Moral Law that

<sup>1</sup> There is, for example, the famous puzzle with regard to the permissibility of an untruth when no other means would avail to save the life of a fugitive whom his would-be murderer was pursuing.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 8-10 (Revised Version).

the inalienable testimony of consciousness to the freedom of the will is seen to be a necessary truth. In the same light must be estimated the religious doctrine of a great final judgment, the hope of immortality, and the vision of a world, to quote Bishop Temple's words—

'a world in which all the inequalities of this present world shall be redressed; in which truth, justice, and love shall visibly reign; in which temptations shall cease, and sin shall cease also; in which the upward strivings of noble souls shall find their end, and holiness shall supersede penitence, and hearts shall be pure of all defilement.'<sup>1</sup>

It is in the same light that the claim of revelation must be considered, and in particular the claim of the one perfect Son of man to be accepted as the revelation of God, and as the Lord of the conscience, of the heart, and of the will.<sup>2</sup> For, to glance hastily upon one aspect only of the case, the conscience of mankind needed enlightenment. How then was such enlightenment to be obtained? We enter here upon the great question which lay at the bottom of the Deist controversy in the last century, and many of the arguments then employed are valid still to prove the necessity and the fact of revelation, such as the unfruitfulness and transitoriness of mere philosophical systems, the satisfying nature of the moral and spiritual ideas of the Bible, the undeniable results of Biblical religion, the special grandeur, moral, spiritual, and as regards practical consequences, of Christianity. Nor have these arguments merely retained such force as they possessed in the last century. Wider knowledge of non-Christian systems has only served to show the immeasurable superiority of the Christian. It is with ampler evidence that we can now maintain, as Bishop Temple does, in reference to our Blessed Lord's teaching—

'Taken as a whole, this is quite unlike all moral teaching that preceded it, and there is no indication that any philosophy could ever have evolved it. . . . We find it impossible to assert that by any working of human thought this morality could have been obtained by the spiritual faculty unaided. On the contrary, it seems more near the truth to say that we could never have obtained so clear a conception of the great Moral Law if the teaching of the New Testament had not enlightened and purified the spiritual faculty itself.'<sup>3</sup>

It is admitted on all hands that religious knowledge has been marked by growth and development. In the view of a

<sup>1</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 248 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 145, 146.

believer this amounts only to the admission that the Divine gift was bestowed in proportion as the spiritual faculty was prepared to receive it. But inferences hostile to the belief in revelation have been drawn from the fact. Bishop Temple has therefore done good service in bringing into prominence the parallel case of scientific knowledge. He argues with force and clearness that the fact of development does not in either case affect the validity of the resulting beliefs. 'Religion,' he says, 'grows, but the facts of which it takes cognizance are not affected by that growth.' And again, 'The pure subjectivity of Religion, to use technical language, is no more proved' by the fact of development 'than the pure subjectivity of Science.'<sup>1</sup>

We must, however, digress a little in order to offer a word of criticism. In illustration of his views the Bishop remarks as follows:—

'Ezekiel rises above the doctrine that the children are punished for the sins of their parents, just as Galileo rises above the doctrine that nature abhors a vacuum.'<sup>2</sup>

This sentence stands unqualified in the midst of a paragraph that treats of growth 'through mistakes' in religion and in science. The natural implication is that we are to regard neither of the two doctrines mentioned as representative of truth. But in point of fact an important reality underlies each, though a different form of words might preferably be chosen to express it.

Firstly, as regards the doctrine that children are punished for the sins of their parents. The error which Ezekiel denounced was the belief that the strictest obedience to the Divine Moral Law would not shield a man from the condemnation that his father's disobedience had incurred. That it was a prevalent and popular error is shown by the fact that it had been summed up in a proverb, and that Jeremiah likewise was familiar with the proverb and repudiated its teaching.<sup>3</sup> Yet the truth proclaimed so fully by Ezekiel, and more briefly by Jeremiah, was already implied in the formula at the close of the second commandment, with which every Jew must have been familiar. For the words 'them that hate Me' and 'them that love Me,' &c., plainly limit the predication of Divine wrath and favour in the same way as the prophetic teaching does. But it is only too true that children do suffer for, *i.e.* in consequence of, their parents' sins, and this truth, obvious

<sup>1</sup> See *Bampton Lectures*, p. 132.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 131.

<sup>3</sup> See Ezek. xviii. 2 and Jer. xxxi. 29, 30.



enough before as regards external circumstances, has now received the most vivid illustration as regards psychical conditions from the scientific doctrine of heredity. The truth is that on the one hand the 'solidarity' of mankind at large, and of smaller divisions of mankind, such as nations and families, and on the other hand individual responsibility, are concomitant facts; and Ezekiel's doctrine, important as it is, is only the complement of the doctrine, also very important, that the conduct of the individual may influence for good or for evil generations yet unborn.

We turn now to the scientific illustration. We know not whether the doctrine that nature abhors a vacuum was ever held to be the literal expression of truth, or only a quasi-poetical statement of a fact that even now is not fully understood. We can, of course, now assign an immediate cause for the rise of water in the common pump, viz. the pressure of the atmosphere; but we have at the same time a more scientific appreciation of the difficulty of obtaining an absolute vacuum. Has such a thing ever been obtained? The Torricellian vacuum (so called) in the mercurial barometer is now said to be filled with the vapour of mercury; and were it not so we must infer at any rate that it is filled with ether, otherwise there would be no medium to convey through it the rays of light. If then we do not personify nature, and make the phenomenon the expression of her feelings, yet we must allow that physical laws seem to render the formation of a vacuum impossible.

These criticisms, however, do not touch the main position, which is substantially identical with that repeatedly implied in the recorded words of our Blessed Lord and His apostles. His perfect life and character, the character of His teaching, the results of that teaching on the world, and the results to the individual of faith in Him, alike bear witness to the truth of His claims. They demand our assent to His declaration, 'I and My Father are one,' and they reveal the significance of His words to the Jews who rejected Him, 'He that is of God heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.'

So far with regard to the positive grounds on which religion rests. But science likewise has its claims upon us; for science is to the religious man a study of the power and the wisdom of God. Science also is a revelation, and it is only at our peril that we can disregard scientific truth. Nor is it at all a singular and unexampled fact that knowledge should be the result of a double process, or a process in which

more than one organ is concerned. A familiar illustration meets us in the fact that our knowledge of the form of objects is a composite result, obtained by the combined action of the senses of sight and touch. Another more familiar illustration may be seen in the fact that vision itself is ordinarily, though not necessarily, the composite effect of the simultaneous action of two organs. If there is a difficulty in solving some of the problems which arise from the relations of religion and science, it may be paralleled by the difficulty of solving the problem of binocular vision. Science has as yet furnished no satisfactory explanation of the fact that in the normal state of the organs of sight the distinct images formed on the two retinas blend harmoniously into the vision of one object. That in abnormal states of the organs, such as that produced by mechanical disarrangement, the two images do not blend, may serve to illustrate the occasional disharmony between religion and science.

The chief source of apparent discrepancy in our day between the scientific and the religious faculty is the undue application of the principle of the uniformity of nature. This principle is the expression of a belief, confirmed, indeed, by ever accumulating evidence, yet never completely demonstrable. In its legitimate application, so far from being hostile to religion, it is distinctly religious. It asserts in the world of phenomena the steadfastness of Him who created and upholds all things. Nor is the principle, except in form and in the supposed range of its applicability, by any means a modern doctrine. For if, as some pretend, the religious ideas of mankind were originally obtained from the observation of nature, the observed uniformity of nature must have been in very early times one stepping-stone to the majestic conception of the 'faithfulness' of God so repeatedly insisted upon in the Bible. In our own view the regularity of nature was at least a help to the understanding of such declarations as 'God is not a man that He should lie, neither the son of man that He should repent;' 'I am the Lord; I change not;' and as such it was appealed to by the prophet.<sup>1</sup>

Doubtless modern science has tracked uniformity in large classes of cases in which it was formerly unsuspected; but it has not proved that physical regularity entirely overrides the spontaneity of spiritual beings. We have already seen that the certainty attaching to the fundamental moral convictions infinitely surpasses in strength the hold which any theory of

<sup>1</sup> See Jer. v. 22-24.

evolution can have on the mind ; and similarly the immediate consciousness of the freedom of the will incomparably surpasses in any unprejudiced mind the belief in universal uniformity.

The phrase Uniformity of Nature is, however, much too freely used, as if the laws of it were entirely ascertained ; whereas it is the great task of science to discover those laws. So far science has only discovered some of them in phenomena far or near, which the senses, aided or unaided by instruments, can reach. There are, however, problems scarcely yet attempted, but whose solution, if the uniformity of nature were completely understood, ought to be deducible from laws already known. We cannot, for example, determine what are the essentials or what are the forms of life in other worlds. Our ignorance on this point is frankly confessed by Mr. Romanes, no mean scientific authority. Life on earth is dependent upon carbon and oxygen ; but, as he rightly declares, 'for anything we know to the contrary, life and organization may be able to exist, even if elsewhere it is not actually existing, in atmospheres composed of other gases.'<sup>1</sup>

This confession of ignorance we regard as very important. For the principle of the uniformity of nature certainly favours the belief that life exists elsewhere, though the conditions may differ from those on earth : and this belief does not conflict with religious ideas but is rather corroborated by them. Yet science cannot solve the problem of life in other worlds, though, if the uniformity of nature were fully understood, she would seem to have in her hands the data for its solution. *A fortiori* must the harder problem of life beyond the grave be outside her reach. And if on this point her voice is dumb, there is nothing to distract our attention from the other voice by which God speaks to us, the voice within, which, as we have seen, proclaims us to be partakers of an eternal order, the voice of conscience corroborated and informed by revelation.

Nor, to touch lastly upon the vexed question of miracles, can it be pretended with reason that the scientific postulate bars their possibility or the credibility of well-attested accounts of them. For, as Bishop Temple argues on the one hand, uniformity of nature, if we knew the whole of nature, might be found to be not inconsistent with the miraculous element in revelation ;<sup>2</sup> and, on the other hand, it is

<sup>1</sup> See the *Contemporary Review* for October 1882, p. 541.

<sup>2</sup> The Bishop goes much further than we are inclined to in allowing the possibility of several of the Gospel miracles having been accom-

out of our power to assert that uniformity can never be set aside by the direct interference of the Divine Will. Rather when we take into account the conviction, mentioned above, of the causative power of our own wills, we must believe in the freedom of the Divine Will to act according to Divine Wisdom; and when we believe in the supremacy of the moral over the physical, we must expect that that principle would be asserted in the physical world.

---

#### ART. IV.—DISSENTING TRUST-DEED CREEDS AND STATE CONTROL.

1. *Manual of Congregational Principles.* By R. W. DALE, LL.D. (London, 1884.)
2. *The Congregationalist*, December 1884. Edited by J. GUINNESS ROGERS, B.A. (London.)

SOME two years ago there appeared in this Review a notice of a book called *The 'Dead Hand' in the 'Free Churches.'* In later English and Welsh editions that book, for greater explicitness of the description of its contents, has been published under the title of '*The Dead Hand in the Free Churches of Dissent.*'

The primary objects of *The Dead Hand* were to show—

1. That ministers and members of Dissenting bodies have had, with but few exceptions (that is, in the event of their building new chapels and creating new trusts), neither vote nor voice in the matter of determining upon and drawing up their creeds, in settling upon their prescribed religious ordinances and observances, in fixing the basis of their corporate life, and in defining the legal theological conditions of admission to and exclusion from their Church fellowship, so far as these matters are scheduled in their trust-deeds.

2. That all these important particulars have been decided upon by ministers and members of Dissenting communities in the past, excluding all power of any modification of opinion on these subjects by the ministers and members of these

plished by means of a natural though unusual action of the mind on the body. So many of the miracles, *e.g.* the Incarnation itself and the raising of the dead to life, are left absolutely untouched by this suggestion that it seems to us hardly worth while to have propounded it.

bodies in the present day. That the creeds and prescribed religious ordinances binding upon Dissenters are recorded in their trust-deeds, which have been drawn up by the sanction of, and under the protection and control of, the civil power.

3. That none of the Dissenting communities possess the power of legally interpreting their own trust-deeds, nor of *authoritatively*, with binding force, explaining what the doctrines set forth in such trust-deeds really are, nor of *finally* settling any disputes which may arise in their different communions as to the duties and obligations which are enjoined by the terms and conditions of these 'dead hand' documents.

4. But that all these and such like questions the Queen's State courts, by virtue of *the Sovereign's supremacy over all causes temporal and spiritual within the realm*, reserve and exercise the right of *authoritatively* and finally determining.

5. That the trust-deeds of Dissenters, especially those of the Congregationalists (including under that designation Baptists and Independents), with the extraordinary and obsolete Calvinistic, hyper-Calvinistic, and other repulsively repellent, but happily for the most part intellectually outlived, creeds,<sup>1</sup> &c., which they contain, are inherited or succeeded to with—and in the same manner as they, the Dissenting bodies, succeed to—their chapels and endowments; and that both creeds and chapels must be unconditionally accepted or rejected together.

6. But that it is an incontrovertible fact that, while Dissenters inherit and possess their chapels and pendant endowments on the moral and legal conditions of holding, teaching, and preaching in most cases the crudest, harshest, and most uncharitable of creeds, the great majority of them, especially those of the Congregationalists, are, notwithstanding, the most advanced in speculation, and practically recognize no limits with respect to what is called free-thought and freedom of faith in matters of religion.

7. That no relief can be given to Dissenters from the position of hopelessly involved confusion and wide-spread lawlessness in which they find themselves placed with respect

<sup>1</sup> 'I believe few of our ministers ever "read themselves in" with the Articles of their regulation religion prescribed in their trust-deeds. I never read the trust-deed of any Church of which I have been a minister until years after I had occupied its pulpit. I have in my memory the instance of one of the holiest ministers and most eminent teachers I have ever known, who declared that, had he been aware of the conditions of the trust-deed, he never could have accepted the pastorate of the church to which he had ministered for souls.'—See *Christian World*, February 17, 1881.

to the deliberate and habitual violation of their trust-deeds, and their enjoined creeds embodied in them, but by Parliamentary legislation.<sup>1</sup>

8. But that the very proposal on the part of the leaders of Nonconformity to obtain such relief would fill the minds of Dissenters with consternation, by opening up and fully revealing to them the true state of things, and by proving beyond all dispute their entire subjection to State control and Parliamentary legislation in matters of religion, after all their boasted freedom from them. As illustrations of this, it is sufficient to point out that the Dissenters' Chapel Act of 1844 was necessary to give a new interpretation to certain chapel trusts, and to give congregations in possession of certain chapels a legal title to them. The Irish Presbyterian Trust-deed Act, 34 Vict., cap. 24, was necessary to effect certain changes in the trusts of the Irish Presbyterian body; and the Primitive Wesleyan Society of Ireland's Trust-deed Act, 34 and 35 Vict., cap. 40, was also passed to effect required changes in the trusts of that body.

9. That the serious results of all this are that Dissenters are held in legal bondage to creeds which they do not believe; that creeds and solemn trusts are deliberately and habitually violated by Dissenting ministers and the communities over which they preside, while they cling to the proprietary and pecuniary benefits attached to their belief and observance; and that, in consequence, large numbers of Dissenting chapels with their endowments attached are being held in moral and legal alienation from their originally intended and primarily devoted uses.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'In the course of discussion many years since—for the agitation of the question is by no means new—Dr. Halley had said: "Let any practice or faith amongst us, however ancient, or however general, be proved *unscriptural*, and what should prevent any of our Churches from renouncing it?" This was a very innocent remark of the good doctor's, but not worthy of his reputation for sagacity and wit. Thomas Binney instantly replied, "What should prevent you? The State would prevent you; the State with which you have put yourself in voluntary union—the law, the Lord Chancellor: in other words, the *legal document called a trust-deed, which has fixed your creed, defined your practices, and determined and regulated what you are to be for all time.*"—See *Christian World*, February 17, 1881.

<sup>2</sup> 'It is a fact beyond dispute, that there are many eminent ministers of the body who are uttering from their pulpits continually opinions in respect to God and man, theology and revelation, which contradict on many points the views commonly held and expressed in former days. *It only needs, here and there throughout the country, that trustees should arise with the determination and the means of the plaintiffs in the case before us [the Huddersfield case of Jones v. Stannard], to procure the*

siast  
senti  
and  
for th  
contr  
T  
not p  
groun  
Chris  
rights  
perso  
differ  
garde  
who,  
are th  
dising  
and d  
to giv  
make  
State  
rights  
Pl  
is: If  
liberat  
to you  
condit  
fettlers  
claim  
yourse  
Till yo  
Church  
other s  
other h  
Let me  
beam i  
thine o  
mote o  
The  
a rule,  
accordi  
the stir  
gatheri  
expulsion  
things sh



10. That this is the intellectual, theological, and ecclesiastical condition of State-control bondage in which Dissenting bodies are placed, and to which their most eminent and leading men, who are in the forefront of the organization for the 'liberation' of the Church and Churchmen from State control, are actually subject.

These facts and arguments, it will be borne in mind, are not put forward as a sufficient answer to those who, on avowed grounds of open hostility to the Church of England, or to Christianity itself, are seeking to deprive her of all her ancient rights and privileges, and to rob her of her property. Such persons must be met by facts and arguments of a very different character. But these facts and arguments are regarded as a conclusive reply to Dissenting Liberationists, who, being ministers and members of religious bodies which are themselves in actual bondage to the State, covertly and disingenuously seek as primary objects the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church under the plea of a desire to give her greater liberty, or, stated in other words, who make their professed object of liberating the Church from State control a plausible plea for taking from her her ancient rights and privileges, and robbing her of her property.

Plainly put, the argument which we address to such men is: If the Church be in bondage to the State and requires liberation, you certainly are not the men to liberate her. See to your own theologically, ecclesiastically, and legally enslaved condition first. Burst your own bonds. Break your own fetters. Liberate yourselves, and assert and make good your claim to somewhat of the religious freedom which you profess yourselves to be so desirous of conferring upon the Church. Till you have accomplished these things for yourselves, if the Church be in want of more liberty she must look for it to some other source than to you, and she must obtain it from some other hands than yours: for 'How wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? First cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.'

The argument thus set forth in the *Dead Hand* was, as a rule, met by the Dissenting press with evasion or abuse, according to the prevalent temper of each organ. However, the stir raised by it has gone on rapidly spreading and gathering strength, as the columns of the Dissenting press expulsion of these men from positions they are holding. This state of things should come to an end.'—See *Christian World*, February 10, 1881.

abundantly testify:<sup>1</sup> for not only are Baptist, Independent, Wesleyan, and Presbyterian ministers beginning to realize their subjection to the bondage which we have described, but there are on all hands, on the part of fearless and candid Dissenting ministers, loud calls for deliverance from it; indeed, so much so, that there are serious suggestions amongst some of the Nonconformists for the abolition of creeds and doctrinal schedules from future trust-deeds altogether.

However, even were Dissenters inclined to subscribe to the building and endowing of chapels in the future on this extraordinary condition (*i.e.*, of no creeds being inserted in the trust-deeds of their chapels) as a desperate remedy against the further extension of the present most lawless state of things, it would not alter the fact that thousands of ministers, tied to trust-deeds of the past, are not only in a position of intolerable legal bondage, but practically in a state of theological lawlessness in their relation to the State, and that property to the value of many millions sterling is by them being held in most extreme alienation from its original trusts, being used for the maintenance of theologies diametrically opposed to those enjoined in their trust-deeds.

<sup>1</sup> 'With regard to baptism, it cannot be denied that the New Testament enjoins, and that the Apostles practised immersion, and that the change to sprinkling was made by men, and has no Divine sanction. But how do Congregationalists act in relation to this matter? They actually, by their trust-deeds, prohibit immersion or Christian baptism from being practised by their ministers or in their churches; and they compel those ministers to perform infant sprinkling. . . . It is positively illegal for a Congregational minister to immerse, or for immersion to be practised, in the chapels which are settled on the deeds of the Congregational Chapel Building Societies. If a minister wishes to immerse a member, or a member wishes to be immersed, it cannot be done. And these are the people who glory in their liberty.' . . . 'Most of the chapels are held by trust-deeds which incorporate nearly all the religious errors of which we complain. These trust-deeds practically legalize the very apostasy from which we are now seeking to free ourselves.' . . . 'We unhesitatingly assert that Congregationalists are not independent, and that their claim to be so in an eminent degree is sheer arrogance. By their trust-deeds they practically deny the headship of Christ, the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and the authority of the New Testament; their boasted liberty is very largely a sham, and their loyalty to the Gospel is less conspicuous than their adherence to human traditions.'—*The Christian Commonwealth*, Leading Articles, January 15, 1885.

'On every hand intelligent and thoroughly devout men are asking whether the time has not fully come for removing the "dead hand" from our Church organizations. "Why," say these men, "should we be bound and fettered as we are by the definitions of theologians whose claims were not greater than those of their successors, and whose ability to determine the beliefs and opinions of all time could only be acknowledged by those who hold to the doctrine of infallibility."—See *Christian World*, February 10, 1881.

along  
direct  
nation  
ment  
howe  
possib

T  
publi  
fesse  
trust  
bene  
being  
to sa  
make  
and  
no de  
conce  
secti  
sent  
missi

T  
past  
the p  
much  
affect  
of Bi  
writte  
sary  
in its  
dealt  
Adva  
Chur  
in a  
Stree  
to sa  
Carli  
out L  
Hand  
Nonc  
interp  
Congr  
views  
A  
the es

Relief and remedy from this state of things can come alone from Parliamentary legislation. But action in this direction would be the crowning public proof before the nation and the world of that state of subjection to Parliamentary control in which Dissenters are placed, to which, however, many of them try to shut their eyes as long as possible.

This state of things cannot long go on, for when the public come to understand that, in the name of, and professedly for the interests of, religion, not only are thousands of trust-deeds being ignored by the men who hold pecuniary benefits under them, but that a vast amount of property is being alienated from its original use, they will have something to say on the subject. The Charity Commissioners might make their voice heard upon this growingly grave question, and the exercise of their powers with reference to it would no doubt be frequently invoked, were it not for the State-conceded privilege granted to Dissenters by the sixty-second section of the Charitable Trusts Act, 1855, exempting Dissenting places of worship from the control of the Commissioners.

That the argument in the *Dead Hand*, which, for the past two years in various forms has been well ventilated in the press, is gaining ground, making itself felt, and causing much uneasiness amongst those who are more immediately affected by it, may be judged from the fact that Dr. Dale, of Birmingham, in his *Manual of Congregational Principles*, written for the Congregational Union, has found it necessary to insert a chapter in that book on Congregationalism in its 'relations to the State.' This subject was further dealt with by the Rev. Thomas Moore in a paper on 'The Advantages of an Established Church,' read at the Carlisle Church Congress in 1884. The Rev. J. Guinness Rogers, in a lecture delivered at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, endeavoured to reply, and went out of his way to say some very irrelevant things about the Bishop of Carlisle's comments, because, indeed, he, as chairman, without Liberation liberty, took upon himself to endorse the *Dead Hand* argument advanced in that paper with reference to Nonconformist State control through the necessary legal interpretation of trust-deeds in the civil courts. In the *Congregationalist* for December 1884 Mr. Rogers further reviews the Church Congress paper.

An extract from that paper is here given, which contains the essence of the State court control argument:—

'Talk of subjection to State control in matters of religion, and, as Liberationists tell us, the need of the Established Church to be liberated from it:—were ever the minister and members of any congregation of the Church of England the actors in such a scene as the following?

'It is the Court of Chancery. The judge is of any, or of no religious belief. The point of dispute is whether the minister of a given religious body has, or has not, been preaching, say, the great mystery of the doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, or some kindred mystery. The document in which this doctrine is alleged to be set forth is a trust-deed, in which the mystery in question may have been inscribed by some ordinary conveyancing lawyer, at the instance of a chapel committee. The judge proceeds to hear the case. He tells the plaintiffs and defendants, however, that it is his prerogative, first of all, to decide what this mystery is, and then to declare, from evidence brought into court, whether the minister has been preaching it.

'No wonder that the minister and members tremble and stand aghast for the result as to their freedom-from-State-control theory, but they are absolutely helpless, although they see that the judgment of the court will shiver it to atoms. As was the case in the Huddersfield suit, in the Court of Chancery, of *Jones v. Stannard*, proffers are made to the judge of the help of learned Nonconformist theological professors and contemporary religious opinion, to help the court to a right conclusion.

'The judge courteously declines all such proffered aid, and rules them irrelevant and out of court.<sup>1</sup> He says, in effect, that he has

<sup>1</sup> 'The defendant's counsel sought, for instance, to claim that the "Declaration of Faith and Order," which comes down to us from the early days of the Congregational Union—and which is always included in the *Year-book*—should be regarded as indicative of the religious opinions and beliefs of Congregationalists. It was also an endeavour on the part of the same counsel to show that the expressed opinions of some eminent members of the Union ought to have great weight in determining the requisite theological opinions of any Congregational minister. Vice-Chancellor Hall listened to statements, arguments, and cross-examinations which were advanced and entered into with these objects; but he took no account of them in his judgment. We should rather say, that he took no further account of them than to affirm that they had nothing to do with the matter before him. He confined his attention simply and alone to the brief doctrinal schedule in the trust-deed of Ramsden Street Chapel, and made it his object to determine whether Mr. Stannard's written statements with respect to that schedule showed his agreement or non-agreement with it. He ruled that those statements were not in harmony with that document, and therefore gave judgment that Mr. Stannard could not claim to hold the pastorate of the Ramsden Street Chapel.'—*Christian World*, February 10, 1881.

The *Inquirer*, a Unitarian paper, remarked—'Of course this is only a typical case. It is only one of we know not how many chapels that are in just the same position, but whose case does not come before the public. Now, we say deliberately, that this appears to us a far more

nothing  
tain  
unsat  
cerne  
Disse  
convic  
the g  
chape  
conte  
"T  
test a  
appea  
from  
the h  
namel  
of rel  
"T  
in the  
Mr. S  
flock,  
religio  
"T  
before  
differ  
Free C  
their f  
as no  
pleadin  
positio  
"O  
that th  
interpr  
proper  
"O  
must, f  
himself  
which  
by the  
"C  
religio  
W  
made  
allegat  
Church  
galling  
Establis  
oppress  
held in

nothing authoritative to deal with but the deed, and what is contained within its four corners. He delivers a judgment entirely unsatisfactory, not only to the majority of those immediately concerned, but to the highest intellects and tenderest consciences of Dissent, and in fact against the strongest Nonconformist religious convictions. He tells the minister—though beloved, it may be, by the greater part of his congregation—that he must vacate his pulpit, chapel, and all interest therein, at the risk of being committed for contempt of court.

'The combined learning and theology of Nonconformists protest against the judgment; but all must helplessly submit. No appeal is made to the House of Lords. That would be but to appeal from the lower to the highest of Cæsar's courts, and to proclaim in the highest Court of Appeal that which they would fain hide—namely, their helpless subjection after all to State control, in matters of religion. . . .

'This was the scene which was enacted in the Court of Chancery, in the Huddersfield Independent case of *Jones v. Stannard*, in which Mr. Stannard, though beloved, it is stated, by the greater part of his flock, was, by State jurisdiction and control in Nonconforming religious matters, driven out from his congregation and his chapel.

'This was the scene which was enacted in the Court of Chancery before Mr. Justice Pearson, on the 1st of August last—though on a different issue—when a Mr. Lampard, a minister of the so-called Free Church of England—whose ministers have been boasting of their freedom from State court control—was adjudged by the court as no longer a minister of that community; and who, in reply to his pleadings, was told by the judge that he must have confounded his position with that of a minister of the Church of England.

'Of course we know that the worn-out stock-reply to all this is, that the judge of the State court in these cases deals with the interpretation of a contract, and decides upon vested interests in property.

'“Yes, yes,” we reply, “but to enable him to deal with these, he must, first of all, deal with a great deal more. He must take upon himself to decide what the doctrines or other matters really are, on which he has to deal, and whether they are being affirmed or denied by the parties concerned.”

'Could any higher spiritual jurisdiction and control, in matters of religion, be conferred upon a State court judge?’

We now proceed to notice some of the chief statements made by Dr. Dale and Mr. Guinness Rogers in reply to the allegations made by the author of *The Dead Hand in the Free Churches of Dissent*.

galling tyranny than alliance with the State (as in the case of the Established Church), which our friends represent as so dreadfully oppressive; and we further say that it is a delusion to call the Churches held in this bondage “free Churches.” Free indeed!’

Dr. Dale says:—

'English law regards Congregational Churches as voluntary societies, . . . with power to make their own regulations for the admission and exclusion of members, the election of officers, and the transaction of other business.'<sup>1</sup>

As to how the civil court in any particular case would regard any given Congregational community as having the liberty and power which Dr. Dale seems to think that 'English law regards Congregational Churches' as invested with, would entirely depend upon whether it had a trust-deed, and, if so, on the precise character of the provisions of that important document.

If the trust-deed had already inscribed in it specific provisions to serve as prescribed conditions and methods of admitting and excluding members, &c., and for electing and appointing its ministers and officers, then the community for the time being inheriting the deed and all interests under it, and acting under its provisions, would have no discretionary power or freedom left to it except so far as such power was reserved to it in the deed. It would simply have to act as directed by the deed, bound hand and foot by its provisions. So that, to find out how far 'English law' would regard any Non-conformist community as possessing the powers which Dr. Dale describes, the question would have first to be asked, What is in the trust-deed? The decision of the court upon this subject would determine the area of the liberty and power of the community in question. In many cases, in fact, the terms of the trust-deed cover such a wide field, and are so comprehensive and minute in prescriptions and restrictions, that the ministers and members of a community acting under it have positively no discretional liberty left them with reference to what is to be believed, taught, and observed, as conditions of legally possessing a beneficiary interest in the chapel and property put in trust to which the deed refers. The minister, officers and members of a religious community boasting of its independence and freedom find, strange to say, their creed, their method of electing and dismissing the minister, &c., their mode of baptism, proper subjects of baptism, and who shall partake and who shall not partake of the Lord's Supper, &c. &c., all minutely set forth in the terrible religious-liberty-depriving document; and the specifications and prescriptions with respect to these are as legally and morally binding on

<sup>1</sup> For this and other statements of Dr. Dale's here replied to, see his *Manual of Congregational Principles*, pp. 191-204.

thos  
Pop  
it is  
mini  
ture  
their  
inhe  
they  
at th  
if th  
in an  
I

'  
mitte  
bound

C  
muni  
tions  
laws  
mony  
decis  
there  
civil  
sion  
statut  
The c  
preve  
civil  
of cor  
the co  
Dr

'If  
condu  
it may  
had be  
malign  
no lega

Our  
person  
think  
before  
questio  
of whic  
in almo  
VOL.



those who enjoy an interest under the deed, as is the Creed of Pope Pius IV. binding upon the devout Romanist. Indeed, it is asserted that at least the majority of Nonconformist ministers, including their most learned, intellectual, and cultured men, boasting in their enjoyment of the freedom of their faith and the freedom of the 'Free Churches,' have inherited creeds made for them generations ago; and although they have ceased to believe them, they can only deny them at the risk of forfeiting all benefits in their chapels, which, if the statement made be correct, to say the least of it, they in any case illegally hold.

Dr. Dale says:—

'The members of a Congregational Church have voluntarily submitted themselves to the discipline of the Church, *and are therefore bound by its decisions.*'

Our reply is—that the members of a Nonconformist community are not bound by its decisions except on two conditions: 1st. That the decisions are in accordance with the laws of the realm; 2nd. This being so, that they are in harmony with the trust-deed. Any persons aggrieved with the decisions of a Nonconformist community, being members thereof, would have a sufficient basis for an appeal to the civil court for remedy on the alleged grounds that the decision of the body to which they belonged was contrary to statute law or contrary to the provisions of the trust-deed. The court might find against the plaintiff, but that would not prevent the religious body concerned being dragged into the civil court, to have its proceedings in the matter complained of completely reviewed by the civil judge, so as to enable the court to give judgment.

Dr. Dale says:—

'If a Church member, excluded from fellowship for immoral conduct, prosecuted the minister or other Church officers for slander it may be assumed that *if the usual customs and practices of the Church had been followed* in his exclusion, and if there was no proof of malignity, the court would determine that the excluded person had no legal ground of complaint.'

Our reply is—that it is unsafe for Dr. Dale or any other person to assume anything as to what the courts of law may think fit to decide upon Dissenting cases which may come before them—cases which are not only not identical in the questions to be tried, nor in the causes and circumstances out of which they arise, but which, as a rule, differ very materially in almost every respect. Further, we may observe that the

VOL. XIX.—NO. XXXIX.

G

plea of any religious body in court, that it was justified in exercising discipline upon the aggrieved party complaining of its proceedings to the court, inasmuch as in doing so the usual customs and practices of the Church had been strictly followed, would be of no avail if the plaintiff could show that such proceedings were contrary to the law of the land, or in contravention of the provisions of the trust-deed of the community in question. The 'customs and practices of the Church being observed' would be no legal plea which any religious community could make in court in justification of its proceedings in the matter of the exercise of discipline upon any of its members, unless it could show that such 'customs and practices' were not only in harmony with the law of the land, but in harmony with its own trust-deed.

So that it comes to this—The liberty, or freedom, or call it what you like, of a Nonconformist community to exercise discipline upon its members is a liberty restricted by the law of the land made by the State, and by the law of the trust-deed laid down by persons who have long since passed away from earth, but who really govern their successors from the grave or from the other world, with respect to doctrines and practices of religion on terms inscribed in the trust-deed by 'dead hands' now mouldering in the dust.

Dr. Dale further says:—

'It may be assumed that they [the civil or State courts] would decline to consider whether the decision of the court was justified by the evidence.'

In reply, we ask Dr. Dale whether he can point to any case of the civil court refusing to inquire into the alleged grievance of any complainant member of a Nonconformist body, who sought from it redress upon the alleged ground that such body had exercised its powers of discipline upon him to his supposed injury, contrary to the weight of evidence, and therefore unjustly. Until such a decision constituting such a precedent can be quoted, Dr. Dale is only—most unintentionally we admit, but nevertheless really and seriously—misleading his readers in telling them in a semi-official book of the Congregational Union what '*may be assumed*' or what may not be assumed in the matter.

Dr. Dale says:—

'Nor would exclusion from Communion be regarded as constituting a claim for damages, since Church membership confers no advantages having a pecuniary value.'

Our reply to Dr. Dale is that Church membership in Congregational communities, if it confers 'no advantages having

a p  
of  
enc  
cha  
dee  
par  
and  
stip  
upo  
of t  
pen  
of d  
the  
men  
men  
bein  
least  
of th  
inqu  
right  
goin  
the v  
any  
from  
comp  
the c  
sitate  
T  
that  
upon  
obser  
court  
and f  
therel  
seeks  
T  
Hand  
It was  
been a  
at Cro  
comm  
first in  
Mr. Ju  
doubt,  
led: n

a pecuniary value,' certainly does confer a franchise which has often to be exercised, or at least may be exercised, with reference to chapel pecuniary matters—such as dealing with the chapel endowments and property, if any, so far as the trust-deed may leave the members at liberty to deal with it; partial control over the finances of the community, the fixing and determining, increasing or decreasing, of the minister's stipend, &c. But besides these advantages there is conferred upon every member of the community the proportional right of taking part in appointing, controlling, and retaining or dispensing with, the services of the minister, and the exercising of discipline—where necessary, and so far as the law allows, and the provisions of the trust-deed permit—upon offending members of the body. These rights and privileges any member of a religious community would of course forfeit on being cut off from its fellowship, and it may, we think, at least be safely stated that any person, having been deprived of these rights, would have some claim upon the civil court to inquire on his behalf whether, on the whole, he had been rightly deprived of them. Of course this would necessitate going into the entire case by way of the court's reviewing the whole proceedings. We have never known nor heard of any decision of the civil court by which it has precluded itself from entering upon such an inquiry if, on the face of the complaint of any aggrieved member of such a community, the court deemed that there were sufficient grounds to necessitate and justify such an investigation.

The most recent case within our knowledge goes to show that no religious body can exercise arbitrary powers of discipline upon its members—even when it follows its own customs and observances—without being answerable afterwards to the civil court for the manner in which it has exercised its powers, and for the supposed or alleged social damage which it has thereby inflicted upon the aggrieved person concerned who seeks redress from the court.

The case we refer to will be found recorded in *The Dead Hand in the Free Churches of Dissent* (cheap edition, pp. 56-7). It was tried in the Court of Queen's Bench. The plaintiff had been a member of the community of the Christian Brethren at Croydon, but, for reasons which the representatives of the community attempted to state in court, they refused in the first instance to give an account of their proceedings before Mr. Justice Denman, on the delusive grounds by which, no doubt, so many people—Dr. Dale included—seem to be misled: namely, that a religious community may at will exercise

discipline upon any alleged offending member, and may, in the assertion and maintenance of its spiritual and ecclesiastical freedom, refuse to explain and justify its proceedings in such a matter to the civil court when called upon to do so.

The people at Croydon, however, called Christian Brethren, learnt a severe lesson on this subject from the lips of Mr. Justice Denman. The case was remitted to the jury, and that body found a verdict for the plaintiff, who received 50*l.* damages and costs. The account of the proceedings as given in the *Standard* runs thus :—

‘The plaintiff and defendant were members of the religious community known as the Plymouth Brethren. There had been a disagreement between them about their Church matters. In December 1879 the plaintiff was called in as a witness in a County Court case at Croydon, in which the evidence of a dentist was required, and in the course of his evidence he stated that he had been in business for five years, and that he had made thousands of models of the mouth. It was afterwards made a charge against him that he had made a false statement, for that he had not been in business five years by five weeks. Numerous meetings of the Brethren took place, where the matters were discussed, and ultimately a notice written by the defendant was published by him, to the following effect : “ Our brother John C. having been guilty of unrighteousness, untruthfulness, and railing, it is proposed that he be put away from amongst us. If the Lord will this proposal will take effect next Lord’s day.” Plaintiff also carried on business with a partner as a chemist, and one charge against him was that he was not a legally qualified person to sell poisons. The conduct of the body was represented to be of Divine inspiration. Since the publication of this libel his business had fallen off considerably, because the ‘Brethren’ had refused to deal with him. A great amount of private feeling appeared to be introduced into the case, which had been tried on a former occasion.—The plaintiff was called in support of his case, as was also the defendant, who stated that he had not engaged counsel on his behalf, regarding, as he did, the proceedings in this court as a ‘humiliation meeting.’ He then made a statement in support of his case, after which he was examined on oath, stating to the learned judge that he would tell the truth whether ‘he was down there [in the well of the Court] or up here’ [in the witness-box]. Further evidence was then called for the defence as to the proceedings at the various meetings of the Brethren, ‘in order to show that the expulsion of the plaintiff was the result of his own act,’ on which Mr. Justice Denman observed it might be taken as the feeling of this conclave that the plaintiff did nothing that was right and everything that was wrong.—On the conclusion of the evidence his Lordship summed up, leaving it to the jury to say whether there was a libel, and if so, was it justified? If they found for the plaintiff it was then for them to say what should be the damages.—The jury found a verdict for the plaintiff, with 50*l.* as damages.’

Dr. Dale, after describing the general features and enumerating some of the specific provisions in Nonconformist chapel trust-deeds, says :—

‘The doctrinal schedules vary greatly, a few of them enumerating a considerable number of elaborate theological articles, others containing four or five brief statements of the central doctrines of the Evangelical faith, so framed as to allow considerable variety of theological opinion.’

As to the crude creeds and alleged unbelievable doctrines which are said by competent persons to form the staple of the contents of Nonconformist trust-deeds, those who know best what these strangely repulsive doctrines are, how utterly impossible their belief is to many of the learned, intellectual, and cultured men of Nonconformist bodies in the present day, and how widely these creeds are deliberately violated, and their doctrines openly denied *by the very men whose professed belief in them is the essential condition to their holding the pastoral and ministerial office and position which they enjoy*, must be led into strange trains of thought as they try to get a clear and comprehensive view of the question, What is theological consistency? Those creeds contain every form of Calvinism. They assert particular redemption, namely, that Christ did not die for all. They insist upon strict Communion. They dogmatically define the proper subject for baptism, and the mode in which it shall be administered, or whether it is to be administered in any form in their chapels at all, for it appears that in some cases it is forbidden. They set forth and define once for all—the dead binding the living—the doctrinal, ecclesiastical, and disciplinary principles and basis upon which the community is founded. They assert and prescribe the creed of the pastor for all the future.

Probably there is not one creed set forth in these deeds that one educated minister out of five hundred would draw up as expressive of his faith, if it were left to him so to do. But he has no power in the matter. The deed is there, and the creed is there in it, and he must take them both together when he accepts the pastorate of a given chapel. There may be exceptions in which the creeds set forth in the deeds are indefinite, or in which they are loose and liberal, but we are speaking of creeds as a rule. Even the model creed of the London Congregational Chapel Building Society's trust-deed seems to prescribe belief in doctrines utterly repulsive to educated and cultured minds. For this is what Mr. Baldwin Brown stated of an attempt to impose such a creed upon him, but which he appears to have successfully resisted :—

'I have for a quarter of a century been preaching at Claylands Chapel under a deed which I suggested, *which simply puts the building in trust for the preaching of "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God,"* by such ministers as the Church, in the mode duly set forth, may from time to time appoint. It was hard work to get the deed accepted. The chapel had been *purchased* by the then London Congregational Chapel Building Society. It was their property, and they sent through my old friend, the Rev. John Hunt, the draft of a deed containing, I think, all the doctrines not only which Calvin propounded, but of which he ever dreamed. It was a fearful and wonderful trust-deed. I refused to preach under it. The committee said that I must, that they were simply trustees, and had no choice in the matter. It was their business to see that the property was held for the preaching of those doctrines, and they must do their duty. I answered that I too must do mine, and that as they had brought me from Derby to preach there, I would simply go back to Derby again, and so solve the problem. Finding that I was firm to this, they at length gave way, and the deed was drawn up in the terms I have described.'<sup>1</sup>

Now, what are the conclusions from all this?

They are these. Every Nonconformist pastor holds his pastorate, and exercises it, on the terms and conditions as to belief in doctrines and adherence to religious ordinances set forth in the trust-deed of his chapel.

The disbelief in any doctrine or ecclesiastical ordinance set forth in the deed, the denial of it, or the ignoring of it, constitutes both a moral and legal offence, and ground of forfeiture and deprivation of the pastorate of any chapel.

If the testimony of credible witnesses, such as Mr. Baldwin Brown himself, Mr. Paxton Hood, and the editor of the *Christian World*, be true, that doctrines in trust-deeds are generally disbelieved and ignored, even by ministers occupying not only important, but the highest official, position in the denomination to which they belong, what, we ask, is the legal or moral basis of their tenure of their chapels? What their legal, what their moral, right to their positions? Dr. Dale says:—

'Occasionally an appeal is made to a court of law to determine whether a minister's preaching is in harmony with the doctrinal schedule.'

What does Dr. Dale wish his readers to understand by the word '*occasionally*'? If he wishes to convey the idea that while amongst Nonconformists there is a wide-spread and flagrant violation of trusts, they cling to the possession of the property attached to such trusts, it is true. It is indeed

<sup>1</sup> See *Congregational Year-book*, 1872, p. 95.

only  
win R  
the t  
his re  
trust-  
worth  
accor  
facts

A  
Brow  
Engla

'A  
preach  
nothin  
of fac  
and m

T  
Hudd

'A  
includ  
livings  
certain  
deeds.

A  
says :

'It  
of the  
in res  
tradict  
former  
that tr  
plainti  
the exp  
acknow  
come to

A  
writer  
what

'W  
produc  
years o  
gation  
well kn  
pastors



only occasionally that any person can be found, as Mr. Baldwin Brown expressly stated, to 'face the obloquy' of bringing the transgressors into court. But if he means to convey to his readers the impression that the cases are but few in which trust-deeds are violated, then, according to the most trustworthy Nonconformist testimony, his statement is not in accordance with the constantly affirmed and unrefuted alleged facts of the case.

As to the extensive violation of trust-deeds, Mr. Baldwin Brown, in a paper read before the Congregational Union of England and Wales, at Swansea, October 1871, stated :—

'At this moment many of the most eminent of our ministers are preaching under trust-deeds containing statements of doctrine which nothing would induce them to utter from their pulpits.' 'As a matter of fact, trust-deeds are constantly ignored, and by our very ablest and most successful men, chairmen of the Congregational Union.'

The editor of the *Christian World*, when writing upon the Huddersfield case, in the issue of February 24, 1881, says :—

'As matters now stand, hundreds of Congregational ministers—including Dr. B. himself—might be ejected from their pulpits and livings by trustees appealing to Chancery to enforce the preaching of certain antiquated and now unbelievable doctrines of their trust-deeds.'

A writer in the *Christian World* of February 10, 1881, says :—

'It is a fact beyond dispute that there are many eminent ministers of the body who are uttering from their pulpits continually opinions in respect to God and man, theology and revelation, which contradict on many points the views commonly held and expressed in former days. It only needs here, and there throughout the country, that trustees should arise with the determination and the means of the plaintiffs in the case before us [the Jones v. Stannard case], to procure the expulsion of these men from positions which they are holding with acknowledged benefit to their congregations. This state of things should come to an end.'

Again, in the *Christian World* of February 17, 1881, a writer speaks out in plain language on this subject. This is what he says :—

'We do not hesitate to affirm that the trust-deed can hardly be produced (if it contain definite doctrinal requirements, and is fifty years old) which any minister under sixty years of age of the Congregational body could honestly and completely endorse. It is perfectly well known throughout the denomination that ministers who accept pastorates of old-established Churches cautiously avoid looking at the

trust-deeds; and in a large number of instances, when they have been inconsiderate enough to wish to see them, there has generally been some wise deacon or trustee at hand who has dissuaded them from pursuing their inquiries. In fact, the whole matter has passed into a condition of connivance, if not indeed what the world would call dishonesty.'

The Rev. E. Paxton Hood, in the *Christian World* of February 17, 1881, says:—

'The trust-deed amongst us is a kind of dead hand; but the instance immediately before us [the case of Jones v. Stannard] shows that the dead hand may suddenly become instinct with awful life, and a minister may suddenly find himself gripped by its terrible skeleton fingers, and rudely ejected from his pulpit, and possibly from his means of subsistence, and that not because he did not preach the Gospel of Christ as taught in the New Testament, nor indeed because anything could be alleged against the really Christian or Christ-like teaching of his pulpit; but because certain technical phrases, perhaps having no existence at all in Scripture—words of human origin and imposition—have found their way into trust-deeds, constructed rather upon a Pagan than a Christian model.'

If it be asked why this state of things is permitted, Mr. Brown furnishes the answer. Not that they—the ministers referred to—are not all amenable to the law, and liable in consequence to be ejected from their chapels or thrown into prison for contempt of court, but because, as Mr. Brown says, '*no one cares to face the obloquy of bringing the trust-deeds into court.*' Mr. Brown's reason is the true one why it is only occasionally that an appeal is made to the civil courts to determine whether a minister's preaching is in harmony with the doctrinal schedule of the deed.

Dr. Dale says:—

'It is sometimes alleged that under the doctrinal provisions of a trust-deed a Congregational minister is in the same position as a clergyman of the Established Church under the Prayer-Book, which is the doctrinal and ritual schedule of the Act of Uniformity; and that the ordinary civil courts have the same power over the doctrinal belief of Congregational ministers as the ecclesiastical courts over the doctrinal belief and ritual observances of the established clergy. But the cases are in no respects parallel.'

Our reply to this is that, so far as we know, it is not asserted that the jurisdiction of the civil courts over Nonconformists in religious matters is exactly parallel to the jurisdiction exercised by the ecclesiastical courts over Churchmen. It is rarely that these cases are exactly parallel. At least, we do not affirm that the jurisdictions are in all respects

parallel  
parallel  
in pro  
jection  
of reli

H  
Church  
their  
gover  
drawn  
faith  
Nonce  
basis  
ances  
origin  
and w  
are in  
the cl  
be sep  
exami  
entire  
clusio  
is suc  
use of  
&c., m  
convic  
theref

<sup>1</sup> T  
with th  
regard  
than an  
with so  
is arran  
of an u  
dealt w  
court.  
<sup>2</sup> 'I  
1881, in  
which w  
of our m  
did not  
is the  
preach  
curse of  
eternal  
deeds;  
ministe  
Christia

parallel, but we do affirm that they are in some respects parallel, and that they are similar in principle while differing in procedure. Though, for the purpose of showing the subjection of Nonconformists to the State court control in matters of religion, it is not necessary to affirm either.

Here is the case: The clergy enter the ministry of the Church of England on the basis of their belief in creeds, and their observance of existing regulations as to Church order, government, and worship, which they have had no part in drawing up or in determining, but all of which are heritages of faith from the Catholic Church of the past. The ministers of Nonconformist chapels enter upon their pastorates on the basis of their belief in creeds and prescribed religious ordinances contained in their trust-deeds, which are of private origin,<sup>1</sup> which they have had no voice nor vote in determining, and which are as much a heritage from their forefathers as are in most cases the chapels in which they minister. Legally, the chapel and the creed must go together. They cannot be separated. We believe that most thoughtful men who examine the question upon purely moral and religious grounds, entirely apart from its legal aspects, will come to the conclusion that in such cases where an utterly unbelievable creed is succeeded to as an essential pendant to the possession and use of a chapel with or without endowments, such chapel, &c., must be succeeded to at great moral cost of conscientious conviction to all concerned,<sup>2</sup> but especially to the pastor; and therefore the rights and privileges attached to its pastorate

<sup>1</sup> The Rev. Baldwin Brown says: 'Let us for very shame have done with the tone of lofty superiority which we are so fond of assuming with regard to creed-bound churches. We are ourselves more miserably bound than any of them. They at least have ancient creeds, and are judged with some relation to the development of Christian thought. But ours is arranged for us, apparently, by the committee of a society, with the aid of an unofficial circular to a few ministers and laymen, and, it will be dealt with according to the strictest letter should it ever be brought into court.'—See *Nonconformist*, March 24, 1881.

<sup>2</sup> 'In the name of honesty, why should we, in this year of our Lord 1881, impose afresh an unbelievable creed upon the neck of posterity, which we ourselves are not able to bear, and which, happily, nine-tenths of our ministers violate every time they enter the pulpit? *Indeed, if they did not, they might as well write Ichabod on their temple gates. Where is the man bold enough to preach the doctrines he is legally bound to preach?* Total depravity; that all men are born under the wrath and curse of God; the doctrine of election, predestination, reprobation, and eternal hell-fire; these are the doctrines in the majority of our trust-deeds; but the inconsistency, if not the dishonesty, of the bulk of our ministers saves them from ridicule, contempt, and extinction.'—See *Christian World*, March 3, 1881.

must be bought very dearly indeed at such a price on the part of all persons who have conscientious scruples in the matter.

The Nonconformist minister is as much morally and legally bound by his trust-deed and its contents as is the clergyman of the Church of England bound by the Book of Common Prayer and what is therein contained. If the Nonconformist minister be accused by a legally qualified person of violating his trust, he can be taken before the State court to answer the charge made against him quite as easily as can a clergyman be taken into the Church courts for alleged violation of the Book of Common Prayer.

The clergyman, however, would, from an ecclesiastical point of view, have these advantages over the Nonconformist minister: that the tribunal which would try him would, certainly in the court of first instance, be of a purely Church character, specifically devoted to the trial of Church questions (and this, if not in fact, is in theory at least also true of the Court of Arches); and in pursuit of the inquiry as to what was or was not a given doctrine alleged to be contravened, the court would take into consideration, not simply an isolated statement of doctrine in any one portion of the Book of Common Prayer, or in any particular document, but would, in judging of the case, allow itself to take advantage of any light thrown upon the subject by contemporary history, contemporary theology, or current rendering of theological opinion. Whereas the tribunal which would deal with the Nonconformist minister would be of a purely civil and State origin and character, and, in considering the alleged doctrine violated, would confine its inquiry to a bald statement in a trust-deed.

In order to illustrate what we mean, let us suppose that a Nonconformist minister is brought into the Court of Chancery accused of not preaching the doctrine of Particular Redemption, or the doctrines of Calvin, or Final Perseverance, or the Eternal and Material Character of the Future Punishment of the Wicked, or that he is accused of not holding the doctrine pertaining to adult baptism or Pædobaptism, or observing what is called Strict Communion; the power and responsibility left to the civil court in such a case would be much greater than those with which the Church courts would be entrusted in the case of the clergyman we have referred to, because while the State court judge in such a case would be left to the uncertainties of his own resources, the judge of the Church court would have at his disposal, for his guidance, expositions and precedents of Church law and Church court jurisdiction from the earliest period.

Dr  
'If  
ministe  
buildin  
ticular

On  
a part  
minist  
he pre  
his the  
again  
gious  
in mi  
overri  
spiritu  
State  
comm  
buildin  
moral-  
carries  
of wha  
of the  
ejects  
the wis  
has rel  
ministe

Of  
the ju  
'H  
Ministry

No  
phrase  
the the  
among  
without  
that it  
a pasto  
such the  
charge  
from th  
Tha

<sup>1</sup> Is i  
pendents  
pastoral

Dr. Dale says :—

‘If a civil court finds that the preaching of a Congregational minister is contrary to the doctrines defined in the trust-deed of the building in which he preaches, he simply loses the use of that particular property.’

Our reply is—If the civil court finds that the minister of a particular chapel should be removed from its pastorate, the minister thereby loses not only the use of the chapel in which he preaches, but he loses thereby a great deal more. He loses his theological and ecclesiastical case which he had held as against his opponents ; he loses the predominance of his religious convictions, which he had hitherto regarded as supreme in ministerial matters, for the decision of the State court overrides them ; he loses the privileges and advantages of the spiritual character of his pastorate, for the judgment of the State court deposes him from that office as held over a community existing and meeting within the walls of the building in question ; he loses the status—social, legal, and moral—which the possession of a pastorate of a given chapel carries with it ; he loses the pecuniary and other emoluments, of whatever character they may be, appended to the ministry of the chapel from which the sentence of the State court ejects him—ejects him, it may be, be it remembered, against the wishes of the great majority of the people over whom he has religiously presided, and to whom he may have acceptably ministered.

Of a minister deposed from his chapel and pastorate by the judgment of the Civil courts, Dr. Dale says :—

‘He is not prevented from continuing in the Congregational Ministry.’

Now the question is, What does Dr. Dale mean by the phrase ‘Congregational Ministry’? Are we right in regarding the theory of the Congregationalists to be that the ministry among them is not an abstract office which has existence without a pastorate? Is it not the idea of Congregationalism that it is commensurate with the pastorate, and that without a pastorate there is no ministry ; that is to say, there is no such thing amongst them as a ministry apart from a pastoral charge? <sup>1</sup> If this be so, it is clear that the power which removes from the pastorate removes also from the ministry.

That a minister so removed from a given chapel and

<sup>1</sup> Is it not a fact that amongst Congregationalists, Baptists and Independents, there is no such thing as ordination to their ministry without a pastoral charge?

pastorate by the order of the civil power, represented by the Court of Chancery, may go elsewhere and begin another ministry and undertake another pastorate does not affect the question of his having been completely and entirely removed by the judgment of the civil court from the ministry and pastorate which he formerly filled. The fact is, in such a case the control of the civil power in religious matters could not be more thorough and complete ; and no words can explain it away, nor show that the power of the civil court thus exercised over Nonconformists in religious matters is less effective and absolute than the power exercised by the Church courts over Churchmen in similar cases, the advantage being, as we have already indicated, on the side of Churchmen, who are controlled at least by Church courts, while Dissenters are directly controlled by the State-composed and State-constituted tribunals.

Dr. Dale, in writing of the freedom which a Nonconformist minister enjoys after he is by the State court deposed from his former pastorate and ejected from his chapel, says :—

‘He may be elected to the pastorate of another Church as soon as the suit is over.’

Of course he may. Nobody denies this. Mr. Mackonochie and Mr. Green may go and take other charges in the Church of England with the sanction of the bishops of the dioceses in which such charges are situated, but that does not affect the completeness of the control of the Church courts over them in effecting their exclusion from their former charges. So the fact that Nonconformist ministers after being ejected from their chapels and pastorates can, on the invitation of parties competent to invite them so to do, go and preach in other chapels, and accept pastorates over other religious communities in no way legally connected with those from whose chapels and ministries they have been expelled by the sentence of the civil court, does not in the least affect the completeness of the control which the State has exercised over them in religious matters with respect to the chapels, pastorates, and ministries from which they have been deposed by its order.

Dr. Dale says :—

‘The Church of which he is already a minister may retain him as its pastor if it chooses to leave the building in which it has been accustomed to worship and erect another.’

Quite true, we reply, as has several times occurred, the congregation, or the greater part of it, or at least a portion of it,

may s  
penal  
court  
chapel  
new c  
as hav  
the pl  
ground  
by the  
Court  
of the  
on a  
tation  
have h  
basis o  
by the

Dr  
(‘T  
ministe

Our  
relation  
the co  
munity  
procee  
case an  
the co  
tion to

By  
by vir  
officiat  
the mi  
gation  
judge  
his mi  
ship to  
is ende  
the dec  
civil co  
is depo  
in that  
with th  
the pla  
his pas  
court's



may side with the minister, and bear and share with him the penalties inflicted for the violation of the deed by the civil court in compelling them to give up the premises of the chapel, and all interests connected therewith, and forming a new community, leaving so many of the original community as have been plaintiffs in the case, or who have sided with the plaintiffs, to enjoy the chapel and its emoluments on the ground of their conformity to the deed which had been violated by the defendants in the case, who have been ejected by the Court of Chancery. But all this only proves the completeness of the control of the civil court over them, in driving them on a question of theological opinion or doctrinal interpretation from their cherished house of prayer, which they may have built with their own money and put in trust on the basis of a creed for the non-compliance with which they are by the civil power driven out of it.

Dr. Dale says :—

‘The decision of the court does not affect in any way his [the minister’s] relations to the Church of which he is the minister.’

Our reply is—The decision of the court affects the minister’s relations in every way. What, we ask, does the decision of the court affect if it does not affect his relations to the community whose affairs have been brought into court, whose proceedings have been reviewed by the court, and over whose case and proceedings with respect to the point in contention the court has asserted and exercised absolute control in relation to the point in question?

By virtue of the decision of the State court judge, and by virtue of that decision alone, the ejected minister can officiate in his former chapel no longer. His relations to the ministry exercised in that chapel and to the congregation assembling in it are affected by the decision of the judge of the State court. By virtue of such decision alone his ministry in that chapel is terminated, and his relationship to the congregation, so far as it assembles in that chapel, is ended. His office and position as pastor are affected by the decision of the court. By virtue of the mandate of the civil court, and by virtue of that mandate alone, the minister is deposed from the pastorate of the community assembling in that chapel, even, indeed, if the whole of the members with the exception of the two or three who may have been the plaintiffs in the case appreciate his ministry, value highly his pastoral oversight, and are utterly opposed to the State court’s decision, which, against their judgment, convictions,

will, and wish, as members of a community hitherto priding itself in the possession of spiritual and ecclesiastical liberty in the management of its own affairs, as free from State control in religious matters, has deposed him from the pastorate to which they called him, under which they voluntarily placed themselves, and whose superintendence over them they wish to retain, and would retain were it not that in imperious tones the judge of the State court says, 'No, it shall not be.' So complete is the State court's control over the affairs of a Nonconformist congregation in such a case.

Dr. Dale says:—

'It [the decision of the civil court] decides no ecclesiastical question.'

Our reply is—If it does not decide an ecclesiastical question, what does it decide? If, when a Nonconformist minister be brought before the civil court, the question to be tried be one of doctrine, the judge must decide two of the most important subjects: first, what is the doctrine in question?—for no one can authoritatively instruct him on this point: secondly, whether the minister, according to evidence submitted to the court, has been holding and preaching it. If the point to be tried be one of an ecclesiastical character, the judge equally decides the nature and limits of the question with which the court shall deal, and whether the plaintiff or the defendant is in the right. The religious community of which the plaintiff and the defendant are members—consisting of minister, deacons, and members—have no voice nor vote in the matter. Free as they delusively think themselves to be, and pride themselves as they may on being free from State control in matters of religion, they have all to stand helplessly and silently before Cæsar's judgment seat, while Cæsar's officer reviews their spiritual and ecclesiastical proceedings, and delivers judgment, it may be, against their religious opinions and strongest spiritual convictions.

Dr. Dale, in speaking of the decision of the civil court, says:—'It decides no ecclesiastical question.'

Does it not? It decides the question which has agitated, troubled, and, it may be, rent in twain, as is frequently the case, the community concerned. It decides the question affecting doctrine, discipline, or the method of governing the community, which the minister, deacons, and members were anxious to decide amongst themselves, and which, according to their theory, they ought to be able to decide themselves, but which, because of their subjection to the State through their

trust-d  
What  
it does  
Dr.

'It  
Ou  
nature  
power  
questio  
Dr.

'Th

Ou  
court, v  
logical  
set forth  
he, the

Wh  
questio  
general  
violated  
laries o  
tried, M  
soundn  
in his t  
has viol  
soundn  
ministe  
his form  
conform  
doctrin

Dr.  
brought  
a Cong

Our  
a very  
basis o  
clergym  
ecclesiast  
proved,  
charge  
be spec  
jury or  
case un

trust-deed, they have no legal power authoritatively to decide. What does the decision of the court in such a case decide if it does not decide an ecclesiastical question?

Dr. Dale says:—

‘It is purely a civil decision.’

Our reply is—The power that decides is civil power; the nature of the question decided is ecclesiastical. It is the civil power in and from its judgment seat deciding an ecclesiastical question. There is no getting out of it. There it is.

Dr. Dale says of the minister before the court:—

‘The question does not relate to his theological soundness.’

Our reply is—If it be a question of doctrine before the court, what does it relate to if it does not relate to his theological soundness, viewed from the standpoint of the doctrine set forth or scheduled in the trust-deed of his chapel, which he, the minister, is accused of violating?

When a clergyman is tried in the Church courts on a question of his theological soundness, he is not tried in a general way, but with reference to specific charges, as having violated some doctrine set forth or scheduled in the formularies of the Church. When a Nonconformist minister is tried, his general theological soundness is not tried. His soundness only is tried in relation to the doctrines contained in his trust-deed, or so many of them as it is alleged that he has violated. Where is the difference, so far as the trial of soundness is concerned, except that in the one case the minister of the Church of England is tried with respect to his formularies, and *by the Church's own court*, while the Nonconformist minister is tried with respect to his trust-deed and doctrines by the Court of Chancery?

Dr. Dale says, with respect to the Nonconformist minister brought into court, that he is not tried ‘as to his fitness to be a Congregational minister.’

Our reply is—‘Fitness to be a Congregational minister’ is a very wide and loose phrase. It is too general to be the basis of a charge before the court, just as ‘fitness to be a clergyman’ could never form the basis of a charge in the ecclesiastical courts without specific allegations, which, if proved, would with respect to them show unfitness. The charge must be specific, the investigation of the charge must be specific, the trial must be specific, and the finding of a jury or the decision of a judge must be specific. In the case under consideration the question would be whether the

minister, on the charge alleged, be it what it might, was fit to be a Congregational minister of the congregation and chapel in question. *That* the State court alone could decide. We are not aware, as we have already stated, that Congregationalism recognizes a ministry without a pastorate, or a pastorate without a flock. Presbyterians and Wesleyans do so recognize a ministry, but, so far as we know, Congregationalists do not. Whether they do or not does not affect our argument.

Dr. Dale says :—

‘In the case of the Congregational minister the civil courts simply enforce the provisions of the trust-deed.’

Granted. In the case of a clergyman of the Church of England, the Church courts only enforce the creeds and formularies of the Church.

Dr. Dale says :—

‘The Congregational minister simply loses a civil suit, the clergyman suffers legal penalties.’

In reply we ask Dr. Dale—Is not the ejection from chapel, ministry, pastorate, and position, with deprivation of emoluments attached, a legal penalty of a violation of the deed? If a greater legal penalty were wished, let the minister in question resist the order of the State court judge, and nothing could save him from being lodged in prison for contempt of court.

Dr. Dale, in referring to the case of a Nonconformist minister brought into court on the grounds of the alleged violation of the doctrines of the trust-deed of his chapel, says :—

‘The suit is precisely of the same character as a suit to determine whether a sanatorium (*sic*) is entitled to a share in a legacy left for division in equal shares among the medical charities of the borough in which the sanatorium has its offices, though its buildings are ten or twelve miles beyond the borough boundaries. Is the sanatorium a “medical charity” in the sense in which the term was used by the testator? Can the sanatorium be regarded as one of the medical charities of the borough? The question does not relate to the medical usefulness of the institution, but to its legal title to share in a particular legacy.’

Our reply to Dr. Dale is—So far from such a case being *precisely* of the same character, it is not in any main particular of the same character at all. This will appear evident from the following facts :—

could  
quea  
I  
the c  
presc  
In  
an in  
fess t  
affair  
In  
would  
had t  
adjud  
bility,  
In  
wheth  
phical  
In  
would  
respec  
say, fo  
Th  
concer  
preach  
siderat  
its min  
What  
does it  
phrases  
court, h  
these q  
who ho  
plies, w  
there w  
the gen  
Christ ;  
of the c  
minister  
doctrines  
say that  
this doc  
represent  
been pr  
court mi  
VOL. X

In the case of the sanatorium, the inquiry of the civil court would be whether it was such an institution as the bequeather of the legacy contemplated in his will.

In the case of the Nonconformist minister the inquiry of the court would be whether he had been preaching the creed prescribed in his chapel trust-deed.

In the case of the sanatorium the inquiry would concern an institution whose authorized representatives did not profess to have any conscientious scruples as to submitting its affairs to the judgment of the court.

In the case of the Nonconformist minister the inquiry would concern a religious community and its minister which had the strongest objection to its affairs being reviewed and adjudicated upon by the civil court, and which, in all probability, had boasted in its freedom from its control.

In the case of the sanatorium the inquiry would be whether, as an institution, in its nature, objects, and geographical situation, it was entitled to the legacy.

In the case of the Nonconformist minister the inquiry would be of an extensive and intricate theological character, respecting, perhaps, some great mystery of revealed truth: say, for instance, the doctrine of the Divine nature of Christ.

The question before the court would be, Has the minister concerned been affirming this doctrine or denying it in his preaching? But before the court can enter upon the consideration of this question, it must inquire into and make up its mind upon another question, or, rather, series of questions. What is the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ? In what does it precisely consist, and in what words, and by what phrases or sentences, may it be accurately defined? The court, having made up its mind as to the proper answers to these questions, to which it will be admitted that even those who hold the Divinity of our Saviour might give different replies, would still have the question to deal with as to whether there was anything in the trust-deed qualifying or modifying the general sense attached to the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ; and, finally, it would have to determine, on the basis of the evidence submitted for its consideration, whether the minister arraigned before the court had been preaching this doctrine as prescribed in the trust-deed. The court might say that the minister in question had not been preaching this doctrine. Two thirds of the community, through their representative, might protest that in their opinion he had been preaching the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity. The court might summarily prohibit the minister from officiating

any longer in the chapel of the violated deed. The members of the community might refuse to give up their pastor. They are told that they must receive his ministrations elsewhere than in their chapel. They ask how this can be. Where is their liberty and their freedom from the control of the civil power? They are met with the reply that the order of the court must be obeyed, and that if they wish for the ministrations of their beloved ejected minister, they must go to him, he cannot come to them.

What! they ask, is this freedom from State control in matters of religion? It is explained to them by those who, themselves stunned by the judgment of the court, seek to minimize the effect of that judgment upon the long-cherished delusion of Nonconformist tradition as to the freedom of each religious community from State control, that they all, minister and people concerned, appeared in court before Cæsar, not at all in their religious character as Nonconformists, but simply as citizens, and that, after all, the civil court had not infringed upon their religious rights and privileges at all, but had only decided upon the nature of a bargain between them and their minister, and that their freedom in managing their own affairs had not been interfered with by the judgment of the court. 'Not interfered with by the judgment of the court!' the members of the community, bewailing the loss of their worthy pastor, reply; 'what, then, is interference on the part of the civil power with our right to manage our own affairs? We built our chapel,' say they, 'but a few years ago. We drew up and assented to the terms on which it should be put in trust. We set forth in the deed the doctrines to be preached. We called our own pastor and appointed him. From our own voluntary contributions we paid him his stipend. We were happy in his ministrations, and accepted his teaching, whether it was or was not in accordance with the wording of the deed. Two or three disappointed and disaffected members charge our pastor with violating the deed. They drag him into court, and, as his devoted followers who have every interest at stake that is dear to us, we follow him. We, a religious community who have made up our minds that we love our pastor, and are edified with his ministry, and believe, as far as we can judge, that he is preaching according to the deed, have, after all, to stand before a State court until it passes judgment as to whether we can have our pastor or not. And now we are told that the court will not let us have him, unless we give up our chapel and all our associations with it!' If this be not State control in matters of religion we know not

wha  
of c

such  
Dr.

lect  
exp  
bein  
bein  
pap  
Wor  
1043

trolle  
to tal

T  
trati  
by M  
M

is tha  
equal

C  
the q  
an a  
Chur  
inqui  
the q  
are th  
they  
State  
their  
and, f  
ary co

Su  
which  
one w  
truth  
is tha  
diction  
in the  
of Par  
Th



what is. If this be not subjection to the civil court in matters of conviction and conscience we know not what to call it.

There really is no precise sameness of character between such a sorrowful case as this and the sanatorium case which Dr. Dale mentions and relies upon as an illustration.

We now turn to the Rev. J. Guinness Rogers, who, in a lecture delivered at the Memorial Hall, in November 1884, in explanation of the position of a Nonconformist minister not being, as he alleges, subject to State control by the fact of his being brought before the court, and in reply to Mr. Moore's paper at the Church Congress, said, as reported in the *Christian World* (see also *Congregationalist* for December 1884, pp. 1043-6, edited by Rev. J. Guinness Rogers, B.A.):—

'You might just as well argue that a grocer is established or controlled because, when he meets with a bad debt in business, he has to take proceedings against the debtor in the County Court.'

The same answer which we have given to Dr. Dale's illustration will dispose of the fallacy contained in that adduced by Mr. Guinness Rogers.

Mr. Rogers says:—

'The one misfortune of the reasoning so persistently put forward is that it does not even touch the fringe of the argument for religious equality.'

Our reply is—The Church Congress paper was not arguing the question of religious equality; it was simply addressing an argument to those who benevolently wish to liberate Churchmen from State control in matters of religion, and its inquiry was confined within the narrow and definite limits of the question how far our well-intentioned would-be liberators are themselves subject to that same State control—from which they profess to be anxious to free Churchmen—through the State court interpretation of their own creeds contained in their trust-deeds in case of a dispute as to their meaning; and, further, what is their position with respect to Parliamentary control in case they wish to alter their creeds?

Surely that is a reasonable and definite inquiry, and one which ought neither to cause annoyance nor to be evaded, but one which all persons earnestly desirous of arriving at the truth ought candidly to be prepared to meet. Our contention is that Nonconformists are hopelessly subject to the jurisdiction of the State courts for the interpretation of the doctrines in their trust-deeds, and absolutely subject to the discretion of Parliament for their alteration.

That is a plain contention, and the '*persistently*' putting

forward of such a contention ought not to be regarded by Mr. Rogers as in any respect a grievance, but rather should, under the circumstances, be viewed by Mr. Rogers as affording him a welcome opportunity of completely demolishing the whole line of argument advanced, which, so far as we know, neither Mr. Rogers nor anyone else has yet attempted to do.

Of course it would be no concern of ours what was the relation of Nonconformist bodies and their ministers to State control in matters of religion if Mr. Rogers and those who co-operate with him in so-called Church Liberation efforts did not so persistently invite Churchmen to enjoy the freedom from State control which they themselves allege that they possess. But as they do this with a commendable zeal from their point of view, it is surely a very natural question for Churchmen to ask before they take a leap in the dark, 'What is that freedom?' The subject of 'religious equality,' the fringe of which Mr. Rogers complains that Mr. Moore's argument does not touch, is quite another question, and must be separately argued. If the Liberation Society, which finds such an able exponent of its views in Mr. Rogers, was a society for the simple purpose of bringing about 'religious equality' and not for liberating religion from State control, then Mr. Rogers' criticism so far would be just, and Mr. Moore's argument at the Church Congress would be beside the question and altogether out of place.

But it is just because the professed object of the society is the liberation of religion from State control that that argument is to the point, and must be met before Nonconformists who engage in this work of liberation can make way with thoughtful men who desire not only to look at the alleged position of Churchmen as the assailed, but also at the position of Nonconformists who are the assailers in this matter.

Mr. Rogers says :—

'If we were appealing to men on behalf of Congregational or Wesleyan or Baptist Churches, and urging Churchmen to forsake the Church of their fathers or their own early days, . . . there would be some justification [in this argument].'

But does not Mr. Rogers see that in this admission he has justified the argument, and completely admitted its force, on the very ground stated in what we have above written? For though Mr. Rogers does not invite Churchmen to join any of the religious bodies which he has mentioned, he certainly does invite them very earnestly and repeatedly to become even as

thes  
cont  
'Wh  
alleg  
into

Non  
side  
vent  
Rog

case.

V  
case  
tion,  
case  
had  
the  
pret  
'con  
case,  
cour  
brou

I  
men  
men  
Mr.  
the  
noti  
conf  
perh  
othe

M

'  
the h  
Disse  
ask f  
is no

C  
(  
busi

these bodies with respect to their alleged freedom from State control, and we, as a matter of plain common sense, ask, 'What is that state of freedom from State control which you allege Nonconformists are in, in which the Church is not, and into which you entreat Churchmen to enter?'

Hence the whole inquiry and the issues raised by it to Nonconformist bodies and their ministers are receiving a consideration which they never received before, and which we venture to predict will not be so easily disposed of as Mr. Rogers seems to imagine.

Mr. Rogers says:—

'Mr. Moore's contention is based upon the Huddersfield chapel case.'

We can assure Mr. Rogers that, though the Huddersfield case would of itself suffice to establish Mr. Moore's 'contention,' his argument is based upon, not the legal facts of that case alone—which would be proofs themselves, even if we had no instances to illustrate it of Nonconformists going to the State courts to have the creeds in their trust-deeds interpreted, and going to Parliament to have them altered—the 'contention' is based upon not only the legal facts of that case, but upon a series of varied decisions given in the law courts, and a number of cases which we have referred to as brought before Parliament.

But why does not Mr. Rogers reply to the facts and arguments so forcibly put forward in accordance with this argument by Mr. Baldwin Brown, the late Thomas Binney, and Mr. Paxton Hood, as well as the statements in harmony with the argument, which scarcely can have escaped Mr. Rogers' notice, as they have appeared from time to time in the Nonconformist newspapers—notably in the *Christian World*, which perhaps has been more outspoken upon this subject than any other Nonconformist organ?

Mr. Rogers says:—

'It would be as reasonable to say that the grocer who invokes the help of the County Court to secure the payment of his debts is . . . under the control of the State, as to bring this allegation against Dissenting communities who receive nothing from the State, as they ask for nothing beyond that equitable administration of the law which is not denied to the meanest subject of the realm.'

Our reply is:—

(1) The grocer has never pleaded, with respect to his business matters, freedom from the control of the County

Court, as Nonconformists have boasted of freedom from State court control in matters of religion.

(2) The grocer's appeal to the Court would involve the simple questions whether a debt was owing to him, and whether he was entitled to recover it, and would not touch a question of his faith or his conscience, or his freedom to manage his own affairs and his own concerns with respect to these; whereas the appeal of a religious body to the civil court authoritatively to examine and determine the meaning of the doctrines in dispute in a trust-deed, and whether the minister had been preaching them, or an appeal to the court on a case of discipline as to whether it had been exercised rightly in accordance with the powers of the community which had exercised it, would touch, affect, and determine matters of divided opinion existing in the community in question—matters involving their faith, their conscience, and their believed-in rights of self-government in their religious affairs, which often would have to be decided by the State court judge, though his decision might be contrary to the opinions and wishes of a great portion of the community and their minister so deeply affected by it, and in reply to which decision it would be no sufficient plea on the part of the aggrieved parties differing from it, that in their opinion it was contrary to the trust-deed or to the teaching of Holy Scripture.<sup>1</sup>

Surely Mr. Rogers will admit that this case differs considerably from the illustration of the grocer going into the County Court to recover a debt, and involves far more serious and far-reaching consequences.

(3) But, further, if the supposed grocer lost his case and failed to recover his debt, it might be to him no doubt a serious loss, entailing great hardship, but it would involve none of the serious consequences to him which the loss of a Nonconformist case in the law courts would bring to the community and the minister concerned in its trial.

The grocer, in the course of the proceedings in the County

<sup>1</sup> In fact, no minister of any religious body could appear in court with the open Bible in his hand and legally plead the text of Holy Scripture, or his idea as to its meaning, as against the specified doctrines in his trust-deed. We know not what the contents of Mr. Guinness Rogers' trust-deed may be, but he himself must admit that for all purposes of determining his sufficient orthodoxy to hold the pastorate which he at present occupies, in case of a dispute on the question of his 'theological soundness,' considered solely in relation to his occupancy of his present chapel, it would be by the doctrines of his trust-deed that he would be tried, and not by the contents of the Bible, and he would have to show that he was in conformity with the doctrines of the trust-deed, whatever might be his position with reference to the teaching of Holy Scripture.

Court, would have been called upon to disclose all necessary evidence concerning his alleged claim, and would have been obliged to submit to the ruling of the Court, but nothing affecting his faith, worship, or religious freedom, to put any meaning or attach any significance to these, would be called in question. If Mr. Rogers cannot, from his own shrewd intuition and perception, see the difference between the two cases, it would, we fear, be hopeless to endeavour to convince him.

Mr. Rogers says :—

‘Mr. Moore’s argument may be very strong against the doctrinal schedules in trust-deeds (and we are disposed to admit its weight in this respect), or it may even be pressed further as against the expediency of Churches holding property at all ; but as a plea for the Establishment it has as much relevance as a chapter of genealogy extracted from the Book of Chronicles.’

Our reply is—No doubt, as Mr. Rogers says, the argument is ‘very strong’ in the direction which he states. In making that admission he admits a great deal, for that is, indeed, all that the argument aims at. *In truth, he admits the whole case*, which may be briefly expressed thus : They who would be consistent liberators of the Church from State control in matters of religion ought to be able to show that they themselves are free from this alleged bondage. But all property held in trust under trust-deeds in which doctrines are scheduled, or in which matters of religion are prescribed, bring those claiming an interest in the property under the control of the law courts, if in case of dispute they appeal to the court for their interpretation or on any question connected with them, and under the control of Parliament in case they appeal to it for any alteration in their creeds, &c.; but, whatever form State control may assume, they must submit to it.

Therefore the argument is, as Mr. Rogers perceives and has stated, that they who would consistently assail the principle of State control over the Established Church must come into the field of conflict, so far as that matter is concerned, with clean hands ; that is to say, as religious communities they must hold no property at all, or if they do hold property they must not put it in trust, or if they do put it in trust there must be no prescription in the deed as to doctrine, worship, &c., further than some provision such as this : ‘To be held in trust for such purposes as the community [here describe it] may by a vote of the majority from time to time determine.’

This, in fact, is the logical and necessary position which must be assumed by those who would consistently assail the

principle of State control in matters of religion as in operation in the Established Church. This is the absurd position to which they must be reduced. Are they prepared to accept it? Would people give money to build chapels to be erected upon such an uncertain and fluctuating basis? What, in such a case, would become of the property held under the elaborate trusts of the Wesleyans, the Presbyterians, and the extensively differing trust-deeds of the Baptists and Independents?

But, even then, Dissenting communities would not be free from State control in matters of religion, for, after all, in such a case there would still remain some necessity in their purely voluntary and non-property-holding communities to exercise discipline, and in relation to their exercise of this right they would still be liable to have their ecclesiastical proceedings reviewed, and their sentences, if need be, reversed by any judge of the civil court to whom an aggrieved party might make an appeal according as we have shown.

Mr. Rogers says:—

‘Mr. Moore seems to have got it into his mind that the interference of the State does not end with the question of property.’

Our reply is—It would be sufficient for the purpose of his argument to admit that State control, such as we have described, does not extend beyond the question of interest in property. But, though such an admission would be sufficient for the purposes of the argument, it would not be an adequate admission and representation of all the facts of the case, for the truth is that State control extends to questions of discipline of a purely voluntary society, meeting in a weekly rented upper room, holding no property, and having, as a society, no interest in property whatever. The society as such, holding and having no interest in property, would still be subject to the control of the State courts as to the exercise of its discipline on its members, and the equitable carrying out of its arrangements entered into with them and between them. This, of course, it may be said would be the case of any secular society. Just so, we admit; but the difference would be that in the latter case the State court judge would have to inquire into and decide upon a purely secular question, while in the former case he would have to inquire into and formally adjudicate upon a purely religious question, intervening between an alleged aggrieved person and the community alleged to be the source of his grievance; superseding the assumed self-government of the society in the execution of its religious business, inquiring into its proceed-

ings,  
acco  
pron  
it tho  
regula  
laws  
basis  
be th  
ceedin  
the re  
M  
says:

‘T  
at Ra  
his rig

O  
Stann  
been  
judge  
him?  
had  
On w  
Mr. S  
Woul  
trine  
preac  
to the  
did n  
could  
essen

T  
sialis  
a sta  
T  
whet  
as a  
know  
as a  
of R  
religi  
that  
ter o  
trine  
the c



ings, examining their merits and pronouncing sentence accordingly, approving or reversing the sentence of discipline pronounced by the society on its alleged offending member as it thought well. Of course we admit that, unless the laws and regulations of the said religious community were contrary to the laws of the State, the State court judge would make them the basis of his dealings with the case: but the essential point would be that the society would be answerable to him for its proceedings, and that he would be the supreme adjudicator on the religious questions under consideration.

Mr. Rogers, referring to the case of *Jones v. Stannard*, says:—

‘The court decided that Mr. Stannard could not occupy the pulpit at Ramsden Street Chapel. It did not inquire into the doctrine, or his right to hold it as a Congregational minister.’

Our reply is—On what grounds did the court forbid Mr. Stannard to occupy the pulpit of the chapel of which he had been the minister? Was it not the fact that the court adjudged him guilty of something that was alleged against him? What was alleged against him? Was it not that he had not preached the doctrines scheduled in his trust-deed? On what grounds could the court come to the conclusion that Mr. Stannard had violated the doctrine of his trust-deed? Would not the grounds be that the judge, having the doctrine of the trust-deed and the testimony as to Mr. Stannard's preaching before him, had inquired into both, and had come to the conclusion that the matter of Mr. Stannard's preaching did not agree with the doctrine of the trust-deed? Now, could a judge examine into a case, and pass sentence on its essential merits, which he had not inquired into?

The wonder is that such an able and astute controversialist as Mr. Rogers is could deliberately have allowed such a statement to escape from his pen.

Then as to the alleged non-inquiry of the court as to whether Mr. Stannard had a right to hold a certain doctrine as a Congregational minister, we reply: the court did not know Mr. Stannard at all as a ‘Congregational minister,’ nor as a minister in any sense of the word, except as the minister of Ramsden Street Congregational Chapel. It was in his religious office and capacity as the minister of that chapel that he was arraigned before the court. It was as the minister of that chapel he was accused of preaching certain doctrines, and it was with respect to the ministry of that chapel the court decided that the preaching of certain doctrines

could not form a part of it, and it was as the minister of that chapel that the court said to Mr. Stannard, in effect, 'You cannot hold your doctrines; you must leave the building, leave ministering to the congregation assembling in it, and cease presiding as pastor over the flock meeting within its walls.'

Mr. Rogers, in his further description of the proceedings of the Court of Chancery in the Huddersfield case, says:—

'It [the court] naturally declined the assistance of those supposed to be "experts," for it had nothing to do with the practice of Congregational Churches, or the authority of their creeds.'

Our reply is—Does not Mr. Rogers go out of his way from the discussion of the main question of the absolute control of the State over Dissenting communities, as we have explained it, to deny what nobody affirms? Of course every intelligent person knows that Congregational communities are independent of each other, and that their creeds and religious customs, as set forth in their trust-deeds, may widely differ. There is no union or bond between them, having its source in a central governmental and administrative body, such as is the case with Presbyterian and Wesleyan communities. This being so, in any case of dispute taken into court by a member, or members, of a Congregational community, the case, in its trial and in the results of the trial, affects that single community alone. The court, in its inquiry into the merits of the case, and in the exercise of its jurisdiction over it, would limit itself to the review of that case alone, and would take as the basis of its proceedings exclusively the trust-deed of the chapel in question, unless it were found that there was anything in the deed referring to some other acknowledged authority; in that event, of course, the court would extend its inquiries to that authority. Had Mr. Stannard been a Presbyterian or a Wesleyan minister charged with preaching doctrine contrary to that which was legally set forth as the doctrine of the body to which he belonged, as a matter of course, and as an absolute necessity to the judicial trial of the case, the court would have been obliged to inquire into the doctrines binding upon the whole Presbyterian body or Wesleyan connexion. But as it was, Mr. Stannard being a minister of a Congregational community having no legal connexion with any other community called by the same name and holding the same principles, the judge could not, of course, extend his inquiry or jurisdiction beyond the prescribed documentary creeds which were legally binding upon that separate and independent community. But had

there  
absolu  
provis  
in the  
trines  
the d  
gregat  
sentin  
docum  
broug  
purpo  
collate  
would  
A  
was a  
by the  
proffe  
well-k  
case,  
repres  
said,  
case  
condi  
most  
then  
he ba  
theolo  
decisi  
religio  
in dis  
declin  
views  
in que  
to him  
T  
was t  
body  
tional  
discus  
by al  
of the  
a case  
of rel  
gethe  
loudly

there been necessity so to extend its inquiries, the court had absolute power to do so; that is to say, had there been a provision attached to the scheduled doctrines of the trust-deed in the Huddersfield chapel case to this effect: 'But the doctrines herein set forth shall be interpreted in accordance with the declaration of faith and order promulgated by the Congregational Union of England and Wales, as generally representing the faith and order of Congregationalists;' then this document of the Congregational Union would have been brought into court, and would have been regarded, for the purposes of the jurisdiction of the court, as a document of collateral authority with the trust-deed itself, and, of course, would have very widely extended the sphere of judicial inquiry.

As to the judge declining the assistance of 'experts,' this was an additional proof of the complete jurisdiction assumed by the judge in the whole case. Had he admitted the eagerly proffered aid of Nonconformist theological experts, who for well-known reasons were anxious to get a standing in the case, these experts, and the religious authorities whom they represented, could have turned round afterwards and have said, 'Yes, it is quite true that in the Huddersfield chapel case we were all apparently in the most absolute and unconditional sense subject to the control of the court in the most sacred religious matters by the judge's decision, but then he took our own interpretations of our own creeds, and he based his judgment upon our interpretations and our theological direction, so that after all, you see, the judge's decision was but the embodiment and enforcement of our religious and theological opinions interpreting the doctrines in dispute.' But the judge would have none of this. He declined the aid of experts, and proceeded to form his own views as a civil magistrate of the meaning of the doctrines in question, and whether, according to the evidence submitted to him, Mr. Stannard had been preaching them.

The result of the case is one of historic interest. Never was the subjection, absolute and helpless, of any religious body in its religious concerns more manifestly and unquestionably complete, and the more the case is inquired into and discussed, the more readily and candidly this will be admitted by all persons whose minds are open to the irresistible force of the facts stated, which overwhelmingly show that, in such a case, there is no getting away from State control in matters of religion, even by those who imagine that they are altogether free from it, and who have committed themselves to a loudly proclaimed religious and political crusade, the purpose

of which they allege is to liberate the Church of England from State bondage—a bondage to which they themselves are the veriest victims. This is an unwelcome fact which they must undoubtedly realize every time that their trust-deed creeds are taken into the State court for interpretation, and into the Houses of Parliament for alteration, proceedings which are likely from the growing necessities of the case to be more frequent in the future than they have been in the past.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As a singular comment on the foregoing article we may mention that at a meeting of the English Congregational Chapel Building Society, held in the City Temple on Thursday, February 19, 1885, the subject of the doctrinal schedules of trust-deeds was discussed. The following passage is taken from the Report of the Society, read on that occasion, as it appeared in the columns of the *Christian World*. It may be taken as indicative of a conflict upon the subject which is now being waged by those who represent the old and the new theological dispensation of Dissent. The Report is evidently on the side of the trust-deed creeds and for the abandonment of the chapels by those who cannot believe them. It says: 'No trust-deed can give or maintain that life [referring to spiritual life], but it can determine a certain user or non-user of the material property so vested, and the whole meaning and use of the trust-deed, when passed according to the constitution of the society, is to secure that user according to the intention of those whose money paid for the site and church, leaving those who may afterwards occupy the building, but whose principles differ essentially from those of the founders, full liberty to do as their predecessors did—i.e. to build elsewhere according to their conscientious belief.' Yet after the reading of such words as these Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P., is reported to have said that he 'approved the action of some Churches in which pastors and deacons had concurred in allowing the trust-deed to remain locked up.' Why?—See *Christian World*, February 26, 1885.

## ART. V

1. The IV do
2. Sern an Ed H
3. Colo
4. Twa R bu
5. S. Co (C

ON W  
rest in  
whose  
coffin,  
hidden  
were g  
Staffor  
the Ri  
the A  
Master  
mourn  
was p  
Cante  
being  
lovely  
flight,  
Cross  
at Ma  
H  
and c  
serve  
the R  
ber fo  
the an  
as tru

# ART. V.—EDWARD COLERIDGE AND THE RISE OF MISSIONARY COLLEGES.

1. *The Official Year Book of the Church of England*. Chapter IV.—The Foreign Mission Work of the Church. (London, 1885.)
2. *Sermons on the Church of England, its Constitution, Mission, and Trials*. By the Right Rev. BISHOP BROUGHTON. Edited, with Prefatory Memoir, by the Ven. ARCHDEACON HARRISON, Canon of Canterbury. (London, 1857.)
3. *Colonial Church Chronicle*. (London, July, 1848.)
4. *Twenty-five Years at S. Augustine's, Canterbury*. By the Rev. H. BAILEY, D.D., Warden of the College. (Canterbury, 1873.)
5. *S. Augustine's College Occasional Papers*, Nos. 233, 234. Combined Report of Missionary Studentship Associations. (Canterbury, 1884.)

ON Wednesday, May 23, 1883, a remarkable man was laid to rest in the churchyard of the village of Mapledurham. Many whose names are known far and wide followed the plain oaken coffin, and saw it lowered into the simple earthen grave, almost hidden beneath its pall of wreaths and floral crosses. There were gathered there the Lord Chief Justice of England, Sir Stafford Northcote, the Bishop of Oxford, Lord Justice Cotton, the Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Sir George Rickards, the Archdeacon of Berks, the Provost of Eton, the Head-Master of Eton, the Rev. Canon Bailey, and some thirty other mourners besides the immediate relatives. While the funeral was proceeding, the bell of S. Augustine's College Chapel, Canterbury, was tolled, and on the succeeding Sunday, May 27, being the day of the death of the Venerable Bede, Skeat's lovely funeral anthem, 'The righteous souls that take their flight,' was sung by the students, who had sent a 'Canterbury Cross' of the fairest white flowers to be placed on the grave at Mapledurham.

He who was thus laid to rest under the magnificent elms and chestnut trees of his own beautiful churchyard well deserved this tribute of their affection. But for the exertions of the Rev. Edward Coleridge, and of the present senior Member for the University of Cambridge, Mr. Beresford Hope, the ancient monastery of S. Augustine's would have remained as truly a heap of ruins as Shiloh is at the present day. The

restoration of this time-honoured religious house, and its rededication as a great Missionary School, mark an epoch in the history of our Church, to which the future ecclesiastical historian of the nineteenth century cannot fail to call attention.<sup>1</sup> In the memoir prefixed by the late Bishop Steere to his edition of the *Sermons and Remains of Bishop Butler*,<sup>2</sup> the great author of the *Analogy*, we are told that in the year 1747 he refused the Archbishopric of Canterbury on the ground that 'it was too late for him to try and support a falling Church.' The refusal, if the story be true, may be referred to an inward consciousness that his strength was already failing. But it is equally possible that it may have been due to sad reflections suggested by the existing condition of ecclesiastical affairs at home and abroad.

If the aspect of religion in England was mournful and suggested many misgivings, what was the outlook as regards missions abroad? In what quarter could a spark of real enthusiasm for the spread of the Church be detected? Where was even 'the little cloud' to be discerned like 'a man's hand' telling of the coming rain? The Bishop may well have been pardoned if he said, in the words of the prophet's servant, 'There is nothing.' The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had indeed been founded, but on what a slender scale its work was being carried on! How great were the discouragements! Butler's fast friends Secker and Benson were, like himself, true friends to the society.<sup>3</sup> All preached for it. All left it large legacies. But the important paper, which Butler drew up on the subject of planting Bishops in America, seemed to have been written in vain. It was the darkness, however, which precedes the dawn. Let forty years pass away and what do we see? The scheme, which the true friends had found it impossible to carry out, had already borne fruit, and the year 1784 witnessed the consecration at Aberdeen of the first American bishop.

One hundred years have only just elapsed since then, and the commemorations held the other day at Aberdeen and in S. Paul's Cathedral attest how the seed then sown in faith has taken root downwards and borne fruit upwards. Bishop Seabury has had sixty-five successors in the American epi-

<sup>1</sup> Though, strange to say, not a line of mention is given to these remarkable facts in the *Diocesan History of Canterbury*, published by the S.P.C.K.

<sup>2</sup> Steere's *Sermons and Remains of Bishop Butler*, p. xxix; Fitzgerald's *Life*, pp. lx, lxi.

<sup>3</sup> Steere's *Remains*, p. xxviii.

scopate  
United  
Americ  
in Indi  
bisho  
amoun  
author  
prophe  
Heber,  
Cotton  
son, M  
beside  
the Ch

Mo  
When  
the mis  
to a si  
men w  
pende  
had he  
press a  
Society  
of labo  
her har  
change  
whose  
unflag  
the elm

Ed  
Colerid  
Devon  
Eton, v  
with hi  
Colleg  
of Exe  
his own  
man no  
As  
patheti

<sup>1</sup> Gr  
<sup>2</sup> Th  
Taylor  
Frances  
The wh  
have all



scopate, and what was accomplished in the Church of the United States has been accomplished also in British North America, Australia, and New Zealand, and to a great extent in India, Africa, and the islands of the Southern Seas. The bishoprics of the English, Colonial, and Missionary Churches amount to upwards of seventy-four, and names of which the author of the *Analogy* never heard, and which in his day no prophet or diviner could have whispered—Henry Martyn and Heber, Mountain and Feild, Middleton and Wilson and Mill, Cotton and Milman, Gray and Armstrong, Selwyn and Patten-son, Mackenzie and Steere and Caldwell, and many a one besides—have become heir-looms in the missionary annals of the Church of England.

Moreover, what is true of men is true also of institutions. When Butler and his friends were planning the extension of the missionary activities of our Church, where could they point to a single training school in England for the education of men who should be heralds of the Cross in the various dependencies of the British Empire? Not one existed. Rome had her famous College of the Propaganda<sup>1</sup> with its printing press and its unrivalled Missionary Library; but when the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel looked for a supply of labourers, where could she find them ready and trained to her hand? Here, too, there has been a great and conspicuous change, and if ever there was an instance of what one man, whose heart is in his work, can effect by persistent effort and unflagging energy, it was supplied by him who sleeps under the elms of Mapledurham churchyard.

Edward Coleridge was the youngest son<sup>2</sup> of Colonel James Coleridge, of Heath Court, Ottery S. Mary, in the county of Devon, and was born May 11, 1800. He was educated at Eton, where Dr. Pusey and Dr. Jelf were in the same form with him. He took his degree as a Member of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1822, and was afterwards elected Fellow of Exeter. In 1824 he was appointed an assistant-master in his own former school, being the first instance of an Oxford man nominated to a mastership at Eton.

As a master he was warm-hearted, affectionate, and sympathetic, and soon made his influence felt. Like Bæda, 'the

<sup>1</sup> Grant's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup> The Colonel's family consisted of James Duke Coleridge, John Taylor Coleridge, Francis George Coleridge, Henry Nelson Coleridge, Frances Coleridge, afterwards Lady Patteson, and Edward Coleridge. The whole band, an honoured band, of brothers, with Lady Patteson, have all passed away.

father of English history,' whose knowledge of Greek came to him from that very school at Canterbury<sup>1</sup> which Edward Coleridge was destined to be instrumental in restoring, 'he lived in his pupils and his pupils in him.' They were his 'dearest sons,' he was their 'most beloved master,'<sup>2</sup> and one who remembers him well has told us how in his time, 'from early morning till a late supper closed the day, the tutor's work in school never ceased but for the shortest intervals;' how he 'lived with his boys and for his boys,'<sup>3</sup> sacrificing recreation, amusement, society, even the exercise needful for health to this unremitting task-work.<sup>4</sup> 'Undoubtedly,' said Sir Stafford Northcote at S. Augustine's on S. Peter's Day, 1883,<sup>5</sup>

'there never was a tutor who worked more heartily with his boys, determined to bring out in them whatever he could, determined to spare himself not one jot or one tittle in labour for their sakes; and he had his reward in the intense personal affection which he awakened in the minds of so many of them. . . . He did all it was in the power of one to do in order to introduce a more Christian tone into the school. He, in concert with that most excellent Eton master and Missionary bishop—I mean Bishop Chapman of Colombo—did a great deal to bring about and introduce something of a religious<sup>6</sup> tone into the school, and I cannot describe the intense love . . . that some of us had for him at the time we were under his influence.'

He was assistant-master at Eton from 1824 to 1850, and lower-master from that date till 1857, when he became Fellow of Eton, and Vicar of Mapledurham. As lower-master he marvellously improved that part of the school, raising its numbers eight or ten fold, and might have been

<sup>1</sup> See Green's *Making of England*, p. 399.

<sup>2</sup> '*Dilecto patre ac nostro magistro, Bæda*' (*Cuthberti Epistola*). 'Hæc tibi, dulcissime fili, Cuthberte' (Bæda, *De Arte Metrica*).

<sup>3</sup> Amongst Edward Coleridge's pupils were the younger Hallam, Archdeacon Balston, Lord Justice Cotton, Goldwin Smith, Bishop Patteson, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir George Rickards, Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, and Dean Goulburn.

<sup>4</sup> G. K. R. in the *Guardian*, of June 13, 1883.

<sup>5</sup> S. Augustine's College *Occasional Papers*, No. 234.

<sup>6</sup> With the help of Chapman and Wilder he substituted as a lesson on Sunday mornings the Greek Testament for Virgil or Juvenal. See Maxwell Lyte's *Eton College*, p. 370. 'No one who does not recollect the traditions of the school in the first quarter of the century can believe the weight of the earthy mass that Atlas had to bear—and if James Chapman was the Atlas, Edward Coleridge was the Hercules, and so "Hercule supposito sidera fulcit Atlas." I often used to think in later days of J. H. Newman's sermon on S. Peter and S. Andrew, and compare Chapman to the latter and Edward Coleridge to the former.' C. J. A., in the *Guardian*, May 30, 1883.

know  
fession  
and  
tende  
Provi  
upon

A  
ample  
Thorv  
dioces  
second  
whom  
rising  
Lady  
Pattes  
Selwy  
Howle  
Throu  
to the  
Coloni  
Britain  
seas an

Sti  
already  
the fla  
This w  
of Nev  
of Syd  
1788,  
convic  
left for  
terbury  
Brough  
ordaine

<sup>1</sup> Hi  
quoted a  
passage  
go and a  
of ignora  
<sup>2</sup> 'A  
scrupulo  
principle  
though  
mirth, or  
<sup>3</sup> See  
<sup>4</sup> He  
in the T  
VOL.

known to the world only by his success in the scholastic profession, famous for his zeal, his energy, his power of sympathy, and 'an absolute transparency of character, which never pretended to know more than he really did know.'<sup>1</sup> But in the Providence of God other influences were brought to bear upon him.

Amongst these, first and foremost is to be placed the example of his eldest brother, James Duke Coleridge, Vicar of Thorverton, Devon, whose memory is still cherished in the diocese of Exeter as one of the best of parish priests; of his second brother, Mr. Justice Coleridge; of his fourth brother, whom he called his 'glorious brother Henry,' then 'a very rising man at the Chancery bar,' early cut off; of his sister, Lady Patteson; of that most excellent of men, Mr. Justice Patteson himself;<sup>2</sup> and last, not least, of the late Bishop Selwyn, whom he styles in a letter addressed to Archbishop Howley, May 30, 1844, 'my most dear of all dear friends.' Through them his thoughts were at an early period directed to the responsibilities of our National Church to our vast Colonial Empire, and the duties we owe to that 'Greater Britain,' which has been gradually expanding over so many seas and continents.

Still another name, however, must be added to those already mentioned, as having in a very material degree fanned the flame of missionary zeal in Edward Coleridge's breast. This was William Grant Broughton, who became Archdeacon of New South Wales in 1829, and in 1836 the first Bishop of Sydney. Born in Bridge Street, Westminster, on May 22, 1788, the same year in which the first party of English convicts with their solitary chaplain, the Rev. R. Johnson, left for Botany Bay;<sup>3</sup> educated at the King's School, Canterbury,<sup>4</sup> and afterwards at Pembroke College, Cambridge; Broughton graduated as sixth wrangler in 1818, and was ordained in the same year to the Curacy of Hartley Wespall,

<sup>1</sup> His truthfulness 'expressed itself in a formula that we boys often quoted and admired. Whenever a pupil asked him to explain a knotty passage in Thucydides, he used to say, "I don't know what it is, but I'll go and ask Hawtreys." We delighted in his frankness and open confession of ignorance.' C. J. A., *Guardian*, May 30, 1883.

<sup>2</sup> 'A sound Churchman of the old school, thoroughly devout and scrupulous in observance, ruling his family and his household on a principle felt throughout, making a conscience of all his and their ways, though promoting to the utmost all innocent enjoyment of pleasure, mirth, or gaiety.' Miss Yonge's *Life of Bishop Patteson*, vol. i. p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> See Archdeacon Harrison's *Memoir*, p. x.

<sup>4</sup> He left the school on Dec. 16, 1804, and for a time became a Clerk in the Treasury Department of the East India House.

Hants, about a mile from Strathfieldsaye. Here he was introduced to the hero of Waterloo, who at once detected his worth, and after nominating him to the Chaplaincy of the Tower of London, sought him out while a curate at Farnham in 1829 for the Archdeaconry of New South Wales.<sup>1</sup> The Rector of Hartley Wespall at this time was the famous Dr. Keate, and it must have been while paying his addresses to his daughter Mary that Edward Coleridge first became acquainted with Broughton, and formed that life-long friendship with him which was destined to have such an important influence on his whole subsequent career.

In the life of Xavier we read that the constant repetition in his ears by Ignatius Loyola of the awful words, 'What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' so wrought upon him that at length he resolved to become the Apostle of the Indies. It is not too much to say that the letters of Bishop Broughton did nearly the same for Edward Coleridge. When Broughton reached New South Wales forty-two years after the foundation of the colony, there were but eight churches and twelve clergy throughout its length and breadth, and but four churches and six or eight clergy in Van Diemen's Land. Speaking afterwards at a meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at Barnet, he endeavoured to give his audience an idea of the size of his archdeaconry by asking them to imagine their own Archdeacon having one church at S. Albans, another in Denmark, and another at Constantinople, while the Bishop should be at Calcutta.<sup>2</sup> But the gigantic nature of the task did not

<sup>1</sup> 'As a matter of duty,' said Broughton afterwards, 'the person whom I then consulted was my father in God . . . the Bishop of Winchester. I submitted my case to his Lordship, and I must say, with gratitude, that I received from him the most fatherly advice, the most generous support and encouragement that could possibly be given by one man to another. It was at the Holy Table in Farnham Church that, communicating with him, I made up my mind to undertake the office. Within a few days I proceeded to Strathfieldsaye and was admitted by the Duke of Wellington to an interview, during which he told me that, in his opinion, it was impossible to foresee the extent and importance of the Colonies to which he had drawn my attention. His sagacious mind was directed to all the possible events that might arise out of the then existing order of things in those Colonies; and he added, "They must have a Church." When Broughton intimated his willingness to go at once, the Duke replied, "I don't desire so speedy a determination. If in my profession, indeed, a man is desired to go to-morrow morning to the other side of the world, it is better he shall go to-morrow or not at all." See *Memoir* prefixed to Archdeacon Harrison's edition of Broughton's Sermons.

<sup>2</sup> The Archdeacon of New South Wales was at this time subject to the Bishop of Calcutta. See *Colonial Church Chronicle*, vol. vi. pp. 392-395.

appa  
settle  
the la  
steps  
return  
monit  
Antip  
on be  
sum o  
and  
forthw  
secreat  
togeth  
of Mo

Fr  
Broug  
to sup  
ceasin

'T  
would  
clergy  
my res  
which  
which  
extrem  
ordinar  
forms o  
conceiv  
to the  
wanting  
clergym  
think s  
indeed  
But I d  
of Divin  
opportu  
paralyse  
than an  
ments i

<sup>1</sup> For  
Burton's

<sup>2</sup> It v  
who was  
Feast, se  
Hotel, re  
cordially

<sup>3</sup> See  
the Rev.

appal him. In the course of five years he had visited all the settlements within his jurisdiction, had prepared a grammar of the language spoken by the aborigines, and taken the primary steps for their conversion to Christianity. Then, in 1834, he returned to England, and revealed to this country the pandemonium which she had been instrumental in raising up in the Antipodes.<sup>1</sup> So effectually did he plead<sup>2</sup> with Churchmen on behalf of their brethren in Australia, that not only was the sum of 13,000*l.* placed at his disposal by S.P.C.K. and S.P.G., and by private individuals, and the number of his clergy forthwith doubled, but on Feb. 14, 1836, he himself was consecrated Bishop of Australia in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace together with Dr. G. J. Mountain, who was consecrated Bishop of Montreal.

From the hour of his arrival in Australia as bishop, Broughton's appeals to his friend Edward Coleridge for help to supply the deficiency of labourers in his diocese were unceasing. In one of his earliest letters, dated 1837, he writes—

'There is one possession<sup>3</sup> which, under our present circumstances, would be of higher value than even money—that is *men*, I mean clergymen. My position is very embarrassing and painful, and all my resolution is required to bear up against the continual demands which are made upon me to appoint clergymen here and there, and which for the best of reasons I am unable to comply with. . . . The extremity to which I am reduced is heart-rending. The common ordinances of religion cannot be administered, and when the outward forms of Christianity disappear in a country like this, you may readily conceive that little of inward spirit will be remaining. I mentioned to the Bishop of London once my persuasion that there was still wanting within the Church of England an institution for raising up clergymen for the Colonies. He gave me no encouragement to think such a proposal could be brought to accomplishment, nor indeed could I readily suggest whence the funds were to be derived. But I do request you and all my friends, from regard to the interests of Divine Truth and the cause of pure Christianity, to watch every opportunity of procuring us such assistance. Indeed, we are altogether paralysed. I am willing to work, and do work I believe harder than any Curate in the King's dominions; but without proper instruments it is impossible to do the work required.'

<sup>1</sup> For the miserable condition of Australia at this time see Sir W. Burton's *State of Religion in New South Wales*.

<sup>2</sup> It was during this visit to England that the Duke of Wellington, who was attending at Canterbury the celebration of the King's School Feast, seeing the Archdeacon from the window of the room at the Fountain Hotel, remarked 'he is a superior man,' and went forth to greet him very cordially.

<sup>3</sup> See letter quoted in *Twenty-five Years of S. Augustine's College*, by the Rev. Canon Bailey, pp. 12, 13.

In a later letter, written after a conference with Bishop Selwyn of New Zealand, he sketches the plan of a Missionary College, which he submitted to his friend at Eton, and implores him 'for the love of God not to let go the design.' And Edward Coleridge did not let it go. What he could do for his dear friend Bishop Selwyn he had already done, and proved how deep was his sympathy with the missionary cause. Not only had he assembled at his own house at Eton the forty guests,<sup>1</sup> who greeted the newly consecrated Bishop of New Zealand, and listened to his remarkable sermon at New Windsor Parish Church;<sup>2</sup> not only had he accompanied him all the way from Eton to Exeter and from Exeter to Plymouth; but he had watched the last pebble<sup>3</sup> on which the Bishop set his foot before going on board the ship, and picked it up as one of the last reminiscences of that 'friend of friends,'<sup>4</sup> and when the last parting was over, and the boat was about a hundred yards from the ship, he stood up and called in a loud voice, 'God bless you! God bless you! *Floreat Ecclesia! Floreat Etona!*' and then stood a long while watching on the Hoe, as the ship crowded her sails and glided away into the distance. He who could thus cheer the heart of Selwyn was not likely to fail Bishop Broughton. His trumpet call was ever sounding in his ears. His first exertions were made toward the establishment of a Diocesan Missionary Institution in Sydney itself, but very soon to supply his friend's longing for a Missionary Training College in England became the dominant idea of his life, to which he devoted all his powers.

At a time when missionary zeal was rare, and rarest of all in our public schools, he seemed to be consumed by it as with a fire. In the midst of the harassing duties of a master at Eton, with a house full of pupils, and with the additional cares of Church work at Windsor for which he had volunteered, he devoted himself with characteristic energy to his design. 'Tenax propositi,' he went straight on with his project, and suffered neither frequent discouragements, nor manifold misconceptions, nor adverse insinuations to divert him from his purpose. Circular followed circular, all written in his own

<sup>1</sup> Amongst these were Mr. Justice Coleridge and Mr. Justice Patteson; Samuel Wilberforce, then recently appointed Archdeacon of Surrey; the present Lord Chief Justice Coleridge; the now Lord Justice Cotton; Mr. Gladstone; Mr. Durnford (now Bishop of Chichester), and Mr. Chapman, who four years afterwards became the first Bishop of Colombo. Tucker's *Life of Bishop Selwyn*, vol. i. pp. 78, 79.

<sup>2</sup> On Oct. 31, 1841. See the *Life of Bishop Patteson*, vol. i. pp. 17, 18.

<sup>3</sup> The pebble is still preserved.

<sup>4</sup> See E. Coleridge's *Journal*, quoted in *Tucker's Life*, vol. i. p. 79.

hand.  
peten  
for p  
Maste  
Public  
him w

R  
who i  
design  
from  
worth  
Princi  
and m  
ously  
Instan  
some  
enthus  
fault,  
at hea  
laid h

'I  
brough  
booksh  
(pointi  
what) "  
quite u  
tributio

'I re  
us roun  
envelop  
these, "  
Edward  
saying,  
interest  
have be

That v  
whom  
his pla  
not kno  
duced l

Thi  
cation

<sup>1</sup> Tu  
<sup>2</sup> Sp  
on S. Pe



hand. The first, a private one, to elicit the opinions of competent persons; a second addressed to personal friends asking for promises of help; a third laying his views before the Masters of Colleges at the Universities and the Heads of Public Schools, and suggesting that they should not only aid him with donations but with scholars for training.

Replies poured in from all quarters. From the Bishops, who in various degrees expressed their warm approval of his design; from Whewell, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; from Tait, then Head-Master of Rugby; from William Wordsworth, the Poet Laureate; from Keble; from Lonsdale, the Principal of King's College, London; from Pinder of Wells, and many others;<sup>1</sup> and before long he had obtained a numerous signed list of ample donations and promises of help. Instant in season and out of season, he stirred, roused, in some cases shamed, men into sharing some portion of his own enthusiasm. Liberal in giving as he was himself even to a fault, he did not shrink from pressing the cause which he had at heart upon all who had the means of assisting him. He laid his demands upon them with fearless importunity.

'I can contribute,' writes Bishop Hobhouse, 'one anecdote lately brought to my memory by a friend who witnessed the fact in Parker's bookshop, Oxford. "Mr. Parker, you will send me this set of books" (pointing to a row); "Mr. Hobhouse wishes to give them to" (I forget what) "Diocesan Library." Mr. H., though standing by, had been quite unconsulted. This will show how freely he commanded contributions from the young Eton men whom he had influenced.'

'I remember the way,' says Sir Stafford Northcote, 'in which he sent us round his first prospectus, with his printed papers enclosed in an envelope, on the leaf of which were inserted some such words as these, "If you value the spiritual interests of the Colonies and love Edward Coleridge, co-operate." I remember one of my friends saying, "Well, I do not know that I care much about the spiritual interests of the Colonies" (it was a shocking thing to say, and he must have been rather a reprobate), "but I do love Edward Coleridge."'<sup>2</sup>

That was the spirit with which he inspired all those with whom he had to do. Whenever he knew a man he pressed his plans upon him. Whenever he heard of a man and did not know him, but thought him likely to be helpful, he introduced himself to him.

This habit of self-introduction culminated in the re-dedication of S. Augustine's at Canterbury to its present use.

<sup>1</sup> *Twenty-five Years*, pp. 25-27.

<sup>2</sup> Speech of the Right Hon. Sir Stafford Northcote at S. Augustine's, on S. Peter's Day, 1883.

Hitherto Coleridge had been working in the dark. Communications and inquiries were set on foot respecting Oxford, Salisbury, and Southwell. One proposed one place, and another another. At length there came tidings of one who, roused by a letter of Robert Brett, of Stoke Newington, in the *English Churchman* in the spring of 1844, had resolved to purchase the ruins of the Abbey of S. Augustine at Canterbury, and save them from the desecration of being still used as a brewery, a drinking-house, and a concert-room, or for any other base purpose to which a new purchaser at the then imminent auction might devote them. Instantly Edward Coleridge saw his opportunity. He was fired by the associations of the place. He lost not a moment.<sup>1</sup>

'He made my acquaintance,' is the testimony of Mr. Beresford Hope, 'by seeking me out, and when I got the site *he wrote and asked me if I meant it for him*. I answered fairly that I could not tell. I held out hopes, but could not say positively whether the site was adapted, or whether a Missionary College was the best destination for it. . . . A few months' reflection, however, convinced me that it was so. Thenceforward the two undertakings became united, and then the vague scheme of devoting the site to the needs of a Missionary College became the grand one of restoring the old house of S. Peter, S. Paul, and S. Augustine to the same missionary objects for which it was at first founded.'<sup>2</sup>

The joy of Edward Coleridge was unbounded at seeing his idea taking shape in a way he never could have anticipated. A visit to S. Augustine's on the second day of his Easter vacation, 1845, and a morning spent in surveying the excavations made by his friend Mr. Hope, brought on a

<sup>1</sup> E. Coleridge's own version comes out in a characteristic letter to the Bishop of Sydney, dated August 28, 1844. 'My plan of action ever has been, and ever will be, to make sure of the purity of my principle and of the importance of my object, and then, by hoping and daring all things for Christ's sake, to carry out the one and attain to the other. It was so with the little effort I made for you in January. I asked for 1,000*l.* within thirty days, and I got 2,150*l.* in about fifty days. I went in April last to A. B. Hope, with whom I had corresponded, but whom I had never before seen, and said, "I am come to ask you to give me 5,000*l.* for a Missionary College." He answered, "I like your way of asking, and I hope you will not think me stingy if I do not say 'yes' at once." "Think of it," I replied, "and write to me." In two days he did write, promising to give me 2,000*l.*; and only not giving the sum required because he did not quite see the importance of the object with my eyes. This was pretty well. But I was not satisfied. I wrote to thank him, and to assure him that he would be obliged by his own conviction, on more mature reflection on the subject in all its bearings, to give the other 3,000*l.*, and that he *would not be able to help himself*.'

<sup>2</sup> Letter of Mr. Beresford Hope in *Twenty-five Years*, p. 32.

sever  
word  
sight  
to Et  
writ  
letter  
prom  
boys.  
his d  
oppos  
affirm  
Engla  
on in  
was d  
tervie  
with  
Butte  
use th  
motle  
creati  
else, a  
withal

A  
its co  
thoug  
Whits  
ings,  
the ex  
render

'I  
hopefu  
consola  
some  
"Ah, n  
is to w

At  
definit  
the da  
S. Pau  
nessed  
murde  
scene  
died e  
bury v

severe attack of erysipelas in the head, which, to use his own words, 'deprived him for a full week of the use of his mind, sight, and body.' But nothing damped his ardour. Returning to Eton he was soon at his familiar labours. 'I see him now,' writes one who was under him in those days, 'opening his letters at the breakfast table, with their heavy cheques and promises of help, heavy and many enough to astonish us boys.' He allowed nothing to impede his energy or weaken his determination. Unmoved by the sinister sneers and opposition of those whom he describes 'as clean gone mad in affirming everything sinful and untrue which the Church of England holds in common with that of Rome,' he laboured on in conjunction with his friend Mr. Hope. While Newman was despairing, the two were planning, consulting, holding interviews with Archbishop Howley of Canterbury, and watching with eager interest the carrying out of the designs of Mr. Butterfield for the erection of a building, which should be, to use the words of the venerable Bishop of Fredericton, 'no motley collection of ill-assorted plagiarisms, but a positive creation, a real thing, which may be said to be like nothing else, and yet like everything else in Christian art,' and yet withal the free restoration of the old pile of religious buildings.

As month followed month the fabric gradually rose, and its consecration was eagerly looked forward to. It was thought the students could be accommodated in 1846. Then Whitsuntide 1847 was named. But the solidity of the buildings, and the furnishing and laying on of water, coupled with the extreme severity and length of the winter of that year, rendered delay necessary:—

'I always endeavour,' writes E. Coleridge, 'as far as my ardent, hopeful, go-a-head temperament will allow me, to remember that consolatory saying of good Mr. Bowdler to me, when complaining somewhat of — for checking me in the outset about the college, "Ah, my dear friend, you cannot conceive how great a privilege it is to wait!"'

At length Thursday, the Feast of S. Peter, 1848, was definitely fixed upon, with a regard to the appropriateness of the day for this revival of the old religious house of S. Peter, S. Paul, and S. Augustine. The previous Sunday had witnessed the furious outbreak of the revolution at Paris and the murder of Archbishop Affre. A peaceful contrast was the scene in which our own Archbishop Sumner (Howley having died early in the year) now took a prominent part. Canterbury was crowded on the Wednesday evening. On Thursday

morning a special train, which left London at 5 a.m.,<sup>1</sup> brought the Archbishop, Mr. Beresford Hope, and many friends, to Canterbury. The service of consecration commenced at 9 o'clock, and before the day was over the great design of Edward Coleridge, of Beresford Hope, and Bishop Broughton, had been accomplished. The Archbishop, attended by six bishops,<sup>2</sup> had consecrated, in the presence of the *élite* of English Churchmen, the Chapel of the Missionary College of S. Augustine, Canterbury, itself the Guesten Chapel of the old house, restored and lengthened.

In spirited trochaics John Mason Neale's well-known ballad, *'Tis the Vigil of S. Peter*,<sup>3</sup> describes the scene from the bustle of the first arrivals to the conclusion of the sacred rite. It was a scene worthy of his pen. The idea of the continuity of the Church is now accepted by all thinking men.<sup>4</sup> But it was only struggling for existence thirty-six years ago, when Edward Coleridge gave to the library of the newly erected college the magnificent folio copy of the German Bible, with the inscription—

'Presented to the Library of S. Augustine's College by one who would hereby most humbly testify his gratitude to Almighty God for having been permitted to labour in the restoration of this once holy and then desecrated ground to His service, and the promotion of His glory upon earth. "I arose in the night, I and some few men with me; neither told I any man what my God had put in my heart to do at Jerusalem." "And I went out by night, and viewed the walls of Jerusalem which were broken down." "Then said I, Come, and let us build up the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach." "And they said, Let us rise up and build. So they strengthened their hands for this good work. But when they who heard it laughed us to scorn, and despised us, and said, What is this thing that ye do? Then answered I them, and said unto them, The Lord God of heaven, He will prosper us; therefore we His servants will arise and build." "So built we the wall." "We made our prayer unto God." "We laboured on the work." "And so the wall was finished." "Think, O Lord, think upon me for good."

<sup>1</sup> The Queen's concert had been fixed for June 27.

<sup>2</sup> The Bishops of London (Blomfield), Lichfield (Lonsdale), Oxford (Wilberforce), Brechin (Forbes), Fredericton (Medley)—the only survivor—and Coleridge, late of Barbadoes, the first warden, and the cousin of Edward Coleridge.

<sup>3</sup> It is preceded by his ballad on 'The Martyrdom of the Archbishop of Paris, June 25, 1848.'

<sup>4</sup> For a very striking testimony to the continuity of the Anglican Church, see Beard's *Hibbert Lectures* for 1884, where he describes the English Reformation as 'both in its methods and results a thing by itself, taking its place in no historical succession, and altogether refusing to be classified.'—*Lectures*, p. 84.

my God." "Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom."<sup>1</sup>

These very touching words reveal the secret of Edward Coleridge's zeal, and when we look back upon the years which have elapsed since that memorable S. Peter's Day, the question may well be asked, how far have the aspirations and the hopes of the restorers of the ancient monastery been fulfilled?

The true answer is not easy to give off-hand, but this much at least is certain—

(i.) First, S. Augustine's College has proved its vitality by quickening other and similar institutions. When it was completed in 1848, there was in England<sup>2</sup> only one other Missionary Training College in connexion with the Church of England, the Church Missionary College at Islington.<sup>3</sup> Since then have risen the Mission House of S. Boniface, Warminster; of S. Paul, Burgh-le-Marsh; of S. Peter and S. Paul, Dorchester; of S. Stephen, at Oxford; and on the same models have been founded training schools for candidates for missionary work in India and Africa, in Canada and Newfoundland, in Australia and New Zealand, in Japan and Melanesia.

(ii.) The Missionary College of S. Augustine itself has sent forth well nigh 400 men to various parts of the mission field—amidst the jungles of India, the coral reefs of the islands of the Pacific, the villages of Bornean Dyaks, the unhealthy swamps of Africa, and the perilous ice-bound shores of Labrador. Of those thus sent forth, Dr. Strachan has been raised to the Bishopric of Rangoon, and Dr. Bransby Key to be the coadjutor Bishop of Kaffraria. Of many others, like Phelps and Taylor in Newfoundland; Lightfoot and Gething in Cape Town; Coe, Taylor, Margöschish, and Endle in India; Mesney and Crossland in Borneo; Heard and Josa in Guiana; Partridge in Fredericton; Pinkham in Rupertsland;

<sup>1</sup> Nehemiah, chapter ii., being, according to the Old Lectionary, the lesson for S. Augustine's Day.

<sup>2</sup> It must not, however, be forgotten that Bishop Middleton had founded Bishop's College, Calcutta, for the education of a native ministry in 1821, and had chosen Dr. W. H. Mill as its First Principal.

<sup>3</sup> When the Church Missionary Society first began its work, it depended on the offers of men ready prepared. As the need of specially training candidates for the work became evident, young men were prepared under the eye of experienced clergy in the country. The Rev. Thomas Scott, Vicar of Aston, was the first who was engaged in this work. After that, in 1816, the Rev. Edward Bickersteth had the care of training the students in the present house in Salisbury Square. In 1819 he and his charges were removed to Islington. In 1827 the present college was completed, the foundation stone having been laid by Lord Gambier on July 31, 1826.

Matthews in Brisbane; the Colbecks in Burma; it may be said, humbly yet thankfully, that they have shown themselves capable of strenuous, continued, and self-sacrificing labours as devoted pioneers of the Church of Christ.

(iii.) The intellectual standard attained by the students, as attested by the positions to which many of them have attained abroad and by the results of the Universities' preliminary examination for holy orders,<sup>1</sup> has at least kept pace with that of other theological colleges. This examination, it is to be remembered, important as it is undoubtedly in supplying an external test of proficiency, takes no account of what the candidate has acquired in medicine, music, or the mechanical arts.

(iv.) In more than one very important respect the hopes of the founders have not been disappointed. The educating value of the *genius loci* at S. Augustine's has been strongly felt. The historical associations of the ancient monastery—the visible evidence of the continuity of the Church of England through thirteen centuries—have told on those who have gone forth into lands where so much is fresh and new: once an Abbey, now a College, it is still essentially the same 'domus,' like the cathedrals of the 'new' foundation. The maintenance of several striking collegiate customs—the matriculation service on the eve of Advent and of Easter Day, the solemnities of Holy Week, the early Easter morning assemblage of students on the library steps, the singing of the Easter hymns, the commemoration of deceased students on All Saints' Day,<sup>2</sup> the College festivals on S. Augustine's and S. Peter's Days have, each and all, been recalled to mind in distant lands, and the imitation of them has proved that if 'custom,' to use the words of Lord Bacon,<sup>3</sup> 'is the principal magistrate of man's life,' and 'the force of custom, simple and separate, be great, the force of custom, copulate, conjoined, and collegiate, is far greater.' In this respect the seed which Edward Coleridge helped to sow has not been sown in vain.

(v.) But still it cannot be denied that much remains to be done. The whole idea of missionary work needs to be raised

<sup>1</sup> Out of sixty-two candidates who have presented themselves since the institution of this examination, we notice that twenty-two have been placed by the examiners in the first class, twenty-nine in the second, and nine in the third, while only two had failed absolutely.

<sup>2</sup> At the beautiful altar in the Under Chapel, dedicated as a memorial of Lady Mildred Beresford Hope, and in memory of the first saints and fosterers of the English Church, once buried in S. Augustine's Abbey Church (S. Augustine, S. Ethelbert, Bertha, and S. Mildred), on S. Peter's Day, 1883.

<sup>3</sup> Essay xxxix. upon *Custom and Education*.



to a higher level. The wave of revival and reform in the English Church has indeed reached the mission field, but the class from which her soldiers are recruited for foreign service ought to be more varied. 'It seems to me,' wrote Bishop Broughton in 1840, 'that the larger public schools, aided by occasional contributions from the smaller foundations are quite sufficient to supply the needs of the several professions in England. But in the smaller schools I am persuaded there are hundreds every year doomed to inaction and obscurity who, if they were systematically sought out, and assisted very moderately, would supply exactly the description of persons that we should rejoice to have sent out to us.'<sup>1</sup> The Bishop then instances himself as one who, but for an unexpected legacy, just as he was leaving the King's School, Canterbury, would have been excluded from the ministry through inability to maintain himself at either of the Universities.

But, though in some instances men have been drawn to S. Augustine's and other Missionary Colleges from the centres here indicated, they have been, to a great extent, the exceptions. Since the days when Broughton and Coleridge were planning for supplying the wants of the Colonial Church there have been great changes. Not only has 'Greater Britain' been still more expanded, and the area of her missionary operations been infinitely increased, but the home mission work of the Church at home has proportionately increased, and the introduction of the non-collegiate system at our Universities, together with the multiplication of Theological Colleges, has been instrumental in drawing off many who might otherwise have found their way to Canterbury. Still, there must be many in our smaller grammar schools, many more in our middle-class schools, who, like Broughton, only need to know of these Missionary Colleges, and the curriculum they supply, to induce them to offer themselves for the work which lies before the Church of England in the distant dependencies of her empire. In many places the very existence of such institutions is unknown, and of the multitudes of Churchmen who are ready to support one or other of our great missionary societies, few seem to think of the vast need there is for the adequate training of the living agent who shall be at once a faithful representative of the English Church, and a well-instructed 'Minister of Christ's Word and Sacraments' in far-off lands.

<sup>1</sup> *Twenty-five Years*, pp. 15, 16.

(vi.) Hence it is satisfactory to observe how the rise of Missionary Colleges has called into existence a number of diocesan Missionary Studentship Associations, which have for their object the seeking out and the support of suitable candidates to be trained for missionary work. Started in the year 1855 by the Rev. R. G. Hayne, Vicar of Buckland Monachorum, after a conference with Canon Bailey, so long warden of S. Augustine's, they exist in a majority<sup>1</sup> of the dioceses of England, and during the year ending Midsummer 1884, they had maintained, either wholly or in part, upwards of 111 students. Of these one was supported by each of the dioceses of Chester, Peterborough, Truro, and York; two each by Carlisle, Exeter, Manchester, Ripon, and S. Albans; three each by Canterbury, Gloucester and Bristol, London, Norwich, Rochester, and Salisbury; five each by Bath and Wells, and Lincoln; six each by Ely, Hereford, and Lichfield; eight by Winchester; twelve by Worcester; twenty-two by Oxford.

The results in the Oxford diocese, with its 17 decanal missionary branches, prove what may be accomplished by the energy of a zealous general secretary aided by an influential layman, and show that the well-known missionary sermons and addresses of the late Bishop Wilberforce have not been thrown away, that 'being dead he yet speaketh.'

The value of these associations can hardly be overrated. Many a town and village may be roused to something like real enthusiasm in the cause of missions, if they can be made acquainted not merely with missionary work in the aggregate but in detail, if their interest can concentrate itself on one who has gone forth from their own midst to undertake some task of self-sacrifice and self-devotion. Other things may be to them matters of speculation, but *his* existence, *his* work, *his* success, *his* trials, these are real and actual, and the little body of Churchmen and Churchwomen, who knew him perhaps from childhood, and marked his going out and his coming in from day to day, and joined perhaps in the solemn service at his parish church when he bade them farewell, cannot fail to follow with ever-increasing interest his fortunes in the mission field.

Thus the various Missionary Studentship Associations have done and are doing a great work, and if only they exercise

<sup>1</sup> The following parts of the country are still apparently without any organization of the kind: Staffordshire, Notts, Essex, Dorset, the Isle of Wight, the diocese of Liverpool, the diocese of Sodor and Man, and the whole of Wales except the archdeaconry of Monmouth.

reas  
train  
wor  
on  
will  
take  
a d  
whic  
fitter  
fill u  
to b  
lifter  
answ  
tion  
exte  
dese  
and  
men  
conf  
S. A  
emir  
who

Loci

THE  
eccle  
most  
boon  
Gasc

<sup>1</sup> I  
Newfo  
conver  
upwar

reasonable caution in the selection of their candidate for training, assure themselves that he possesses a real fitness for work abroad, and make their grants for his support depend on the progress he makes at the Missionary College, they will do much for the extension of Christ's Church. Let them take a bold and decided course, and 'let down their nets for a draught' not only in our national schools, but in those of which Bishop Broughton has spoken as nurturing many well fitted for work abroad. There is much, as we have seen, to fill us with hope. Forty years ago it was sometimes affirmed to be a defect in the religious revival at Oxford that it had not lifted missionary zeal to its proper level in the Christian life.

The work accomplished by Edward Coleridge furnishes an answer to this statement. His singular career of self-devotion<sup>1</sup> and zeal in behalf of our Colonial empire, when the extent of our 'Greater Britain' was but little apprehended, deserves to be better known than it is. Now that its extent and its greatness are more appreciated, may we not hope that men will be raised up to prove themselves worthy of the confidence in the future of our Church which the restorers of S. Augustine's so strikingly displayed, and of all none more eminently than the bearer of the honoured name of Coleridge, who sleeps in the churchyard of Mapledurham?

---

#### ART. VI.—GASCOIGNE'S 'THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY.'

*Loci e Libro Veritatum.* Passages selected from Gascoigne's *Theological Dictionary*, illustrating the condition of Church and State, 1403-1458. With an Introduction by JAMES E. THOROLD ROGERS, M.P. (Oxford, 1881.)

THE publication of a contemporary work illustrating the ecclesiastical history of the fifteenth century—perhaps the most obscure period of English Church history—is a real boon to the historical student. To a certain extent, indeed, Gascoigne's *Theological Dictionary* was known to students

<sup>1</sup> Besides giving freely himself to the dioceses of New Zealand, Newfoundland, Sydney, and Tasmania, Edward Coleridge through one conversation with Miss Burdett-Coutts was instrumental in obtaining upwards of 35,000*l.* for the Sees of Cape Town and Adelaide.

before Mr. Rogers' publication. Extracts from it are given by Lewis and by Hearne. But these quotations are but of slight extent compared with the considerable size of the work itself, and touch only a few points. The book recently put out by the Clarendon Press contains a much larger, fuller, and more complete exhibition of Gascoigne's work, though even this is but a selection, and much still remains unpublished. We may assume, however, that Mr. Rogers has selected the passages likely to be most interesting; and inasmuch as Thomas Gascoigne had a most portentous fondness for iteration, and even in the published selections repeats himself with most provoking perseverance, it may well be that the publication of the whole work would be superfluous, and that in the volume before us we have all that we need to wish for. The text is printed by the Clarendon Press in a beautiful type, and the Introduction prefixed by Mr. Rogers is very able and interesting. Altogether the volume is a decided acquisition to our historical libraries. Taking it as our text, we propose now to endeavour to show what was the ecclesiastical state of England during the half-century in which it was presided over by the House of Lancaster; before the commencement of the troubles of the Wars of the Roses, which had the effect of banishing all hope of improvement, until at length in the vigorous hands of Henry VIII. things began to mend. In estimating the value of the extracts we are about to make it must be premised that the writer was a devout Churchman, and without the slightest taint of 'Lollardry,' and also that as Chancellor of Oxford, and personally acquainted with many of the leading prelates of the day, he had good opportunities of judging of the matters on which he touched. Mr. Rogers thus sums up the author's religious views:—

'Gascoigne hates heterodoxy because he thinks it conceit; but what he loves is piety and charity, a holy life, a good example, a clear conscience; and, in the parochial clergy, frequent preaching, open hospitality, and a desire to extend education.

'The personality of Gascoigne is that of a well-connected, fairly opulent English priest, who was stored with the learning of his age, was honoured by his contemporaries, was orthodox in his beliefs, but unsparing in his condemnation of those who did not reach what he believed to be the standard of public and private duty.'<sup>1</sup>

It may be added that he was clearly a man of so simple a mind that occasionally his utterances read like those of a

<sup>1</sup> Introduction, pp. lx, lxi.

child  
stan  
und  
coig  
ever  
ings  
orth  
Chu  
is a  
ligh  
the  
view  
with  
as to  
cent  
such  
teste  
appe  
of th  
he ex  
which  
and v  
hones  
no h  
sever  
abuse  
grant  
ment  
(3) th  
preter  
nothin  
coign  
not v  
Engla  
sixtee  
Monte  
secess

'T  
careful  
it were  
happen  
becaus  
and ver  
and ren

child, but that he had a spice of bitterness withal, as his constant attacks on Bishop Pecock (whom he did not in the least understand) amply testify. It is clear, however, that Gascoigne was both an honest man and a competent witness, even if we have to make some deductions for personal feelings, as in the case of Bishop Pecock. What, then, does this orthodox doctor and respectable ecclesiastic tell us of the Church of the first half of the fifteenth century? The tale is a very dark one, and is scarce relieved by any touches of light. And first with regard to the Pope in his relations to the English Church. Are these relations in Gascoigne's view salutary or otherwise? It must strike anyone acquainted with the opinions of Bishop Grosseteste, that Gascoigne's views as to the relations of the Pope and the Church in the fifteenth century are almost precisely similar to those advocated with such vigour by Grosseteste in the thirteenth century. Grosseteste is, indeed, Gascoigne's favourite author, and he constantly appeals to his authority. Gascoigne does not attack the office of the Pope, or impugn his authority or governing power, but he exhibits in most startling colours the abuses and mischiefs which flowed forth from the exercise of this power in England, and which, had Gascoigne's mind been as logical as it was honest, must have led him to the conclusion that there was no hope of safety for the English Church save in a complete severance from this evil foreign influence. To show these abuses we may take three special points, viz. (1) the Papal grants of indulgences; (2) the Papal provisions, or appointments to benefices in defiance of the rights of patrons; (3) the Papal exactions or levies of money under different pretences from the English clergy. As regards indulgences nothing can be stronger or indeed more terrible than Gascoigne's account of their misuse: and assuredly Mr. Rogers is not wrong in saying that the 'scandals were as great in England during the fifteenth as they were in Germany in the sixteenth century, and had the time been ripe for it Peter de Monte's sale of indulgences in 1440 was as provocative of secession as that of Tetzel nearly eighty years afterwards.'<sup>1</sup>

'The men of our day,' writes Gascoigne, 'say, "We need not be careful against any sin, but, if we feel inclined, may do it, just as if it were lawful. We have committed sin," say they, "and nothing has happened to us; and if we shall sin we have no cause to fear, because near to us is the kingdom of God, and Rome is at our door, and very easily and very quickly shall we get pardon of our fault, and remission of all penalty, if we give money to procure the Papal

<sup>1</sup> Introduction, p. lxii.

indulgence"; and so they omit the acts of true penitence and the acts of due righteousness' (p. 118).

'Alas! men seek to obtain and receive indulgences from God by vile and trifling acts which man commands and grants, rather than by those which God ordains, and which reason and Scripture show to be good—namely, by drinking, taking a long draught from a cup from which men drink to such an extent that they are made drunk,<sup>1</sup> and think by that draught that they shall have plenary pardon from God of many and great evils. For men say nowadays that the Pope and the bishops have granted indulgences to those who visit certain places, and drink to the bottom of such a cup, and offer money in such a place, and they think that the other things necessary to the soul's health are not necessary, and need not be done by them' (p. 119).

'Just so sinners nowadays say, "I care not what and how many evils I have committed before God, because very easily and very quickly I can have plenary remission of every fault and penalty by absolution and the indulgence conceded to me by the Pope, whose writing and grant I have bought for fourpence or sixpence, or for a game at ball." For they who grant letters of indulgence run about through the country, and sometimes give a letter for twelvepence, sometimes for a good draught of wine or ale, sometimes for a game at ball if they be beaten, sometimes as a payment to a courtesan, sometimes for mere favour. Peter de Monte, who, about the year of our Lord 1440, collected a great quantity of money for the indulgences granted by Pope Eugenius, when he was about to embark on his return from England said to Doctor Vincent Clement, "By Heaven, Pope Eugenius shall never have a penny of those sacks full of money unless he shall first send me letters promising me the archbishopric of Milan"' (p. 125).

When such abuses were rampant it is no wonder that Gascoigne should have set down as one of the 'streams of Babylon'

'the false confidence which some have in indulgences granted by the Pope, or by men, which come not from God, because they have not the requisites for obtaining pardon before God. . . . For a man is not set free by indulgence from any necessary and due act which he is bound before God to do, but from the penalty which he would incur from the law or from the sentence of the judge. But he who deliberately rejects and despises all penance, appointed by the priest, I see not how such an one is truly penitent, or how he is capable of indulgence, or how he is prepared to sustain the punishment to be inflicted after death by God, who here refuses all enjoined penance. Oh, how often have I heard worldly and carnal livers say boastingly, "I fear not to rob men, to get gain as I please, to defraud widows and the poor; for however badly I shall act I can get plenary

<sup>1</sup> The meaning seems to be that an indulgence is given as a prize to the man who shows himself the strongest toper.



remission of sin and of punishment by visiting such a church and by an offering of money. Oh, how blind are they who say such things. For how can he be loosed from chains who is still held fast in chains? How can he be loosed from sins who does not leave them, nor do the works required of him by God?' (p. 91).

It is evident that there could be no more absolutely demoralizing and destructive influence than such a misuse of indulgences as that which Gascoigne here condemns. The Pope's factor coming into a parish with his basket full of these mischievous documents was like a moral pestilence invading the land. Not only were the people encouraged in sin by the vain belief that for a few pence they could wipe away all their debts, but the clergy also, seeing the sources of their revenue interfered with by this extraneous and contraband traffic, were stirred up to an unholy rivalry in offering spiritual boons. Thus Gascoigne tells a story of a priest who in preaching declared that if anyone would give him or any of his household twopence, he would stake his soul for theirs before the tribunal of God. Shameful and shameless cupidity was rife, such as was exhibited in the archdiocese of York when it was ordered by the Archbishop that none should be absolved, however penitent, who did not contribute a fitting sum to the fabric of the cathedral church (pp. 121-123).

A subject which excites Gascoigne's indignation equally with the misuse of indulgences is the old and long-standing abuse of the overriding of the rights of patrons by the intrusion of Papal nominees into English benefices. The theory held by the Popes, and which was stated more boldly and more unshrinkingly by Martin V. than by any previous Pontiff, was that by virtue of the sovereign power and absolute authority belonging to the Vicar of Christ, all benefices of every sort by right appertained to the Chair of S. Peter. Patrons or founders might be allowed by concession to nominate, but whenever the original authority pleased to exercise his rights, then the right of the lesser and lower authority was vacated and ceased to exist. It is needless to say that this Pontifical view was never accepted in England either by clergy or laity. There had always been abundant spirited protests against it, such as those of Archbishop Edmund Rich and Bishop Grosseteste. There had been special Acts of Parliament passed to prevent it, such as the three Statutes of Provisors. Nevertheless the Popes continued to sell English benefices and English sees, and to draw a large part of their revenue from this abuse. As a matter of fact

it was found convenient for the rulers of the State to uphold the abuse; for by this means they could usually find a more easy and ready way of promoting their favourites—the Popes being mostly ready to oblige them—than by trusting to elections by chapters, or to the respect shown to letters missive. It is hard, however, to conceive any practice more utterly subversive of efficiency in the Church than this practice of buying reversions to benefices in the Roman Curia. It is said of one Pope (Benedict IX.) that he sold these reversions over and over again, and sometimes twice in one week,<sup>1</sup> and that the practice was rife in Gascoigne's days we have his abundant testimony.

'I know it,' he writes, 'to be a thing commonly practised in England that great and wealthy persons, never elected to any dignity in the Church, obtain from the King permission to accept a Papal provision to some dignity, and so, by means of large sums of money sent to Rome, and by the Pope's provisions, become bishops. In the same way some others get to be deans of cathedrals, as was the case with Master Richard Andrew, a doctor of civil law, who, getting a provision of the deanery of the cathedral church of York from Pope Nicholas V., caused the election of Master William Bernyngham, who had been elected to that deanery, to be invalidated, and when the canons resisted and would not accept his Roman provision, caused them to be excommunicated, and the cathedral church to be placed under an interdict for many weeks, and so the said Richard was intruded into that deanery; and with this he held the deanery of the Duke of Lancaster's College at Leicester, and besides these, many benefices, which he held for many years. And by such means also the Bishop of St. David's and William Booth, Archbishop of York, obtained their sees. This latter prelate was neither of virtuous life nor learned, nor was he a graduate in any faculty, but a hungry lawyer. I believe his memory will be held ever accursed' (p. 193).

'I know one, great as regards this world, but an idiot in sense, absolutely ignorant of grammar or of any true learning, who was promoted by a king, and by the license of Pope Eugenius IV., to a great archdeaconry of one hundred pounds in value, and in addition to no less than twelve prebends, and retained them, as I know, for twenty years, and all the time resided in none of them, nor gave away a penny of alms in them, receiving his payments from secular men who managed his property, and who appointed in the archdeaconry which he held an official to collect the money every year; and he had a license for not holding visitations and for not taking priest's orders from Pope Eugenius. And I know that this person was drunk every day. And because he had been a foolish companion of a certain king, and his playfellow in his youth, he was thus promoted by the interest of certain laymen who called themselves his creditors' (p. 166).

<sup>1</sup> See Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi. 259.

These, it must be confessed, are pretty pungent specimens of the virtues of Papal provisions, and of the effect upon the Church of allowing any disreputable or ignorant clerk to purchase for himself a benefice in the Court of Rome. Gascoigne might well exclaim—

'Rome has been the principal wild boar to lay waste the vineyard of the Church, by reserving to itself the elections of bishops, so as not to give an episcopal church to any save they first pay the annates or firstfruits of the church. She has also destroyed the vineyard of the Church of God by invalidating the elections of all bishops in England, and by promoting evil persons by agreement with the King, and by decreeing that all elections of bishops pertain to the Apostolical Chamber—that is, the Pope and the Cardinals—and by calling none a bishop except he be chosen by the Cardinals, and first pay thousands of marks in gifts to the Roman courtiers' (p. 13).

Should a prelate have conscientiously refused to buy his nomination to a see, and should he be scrupulously anxious to avoid simoniacal contracts, yet he could not obtain institution to his preferment without ruinous payments to Rome. In the Act of Parliament 6 Henry IV. c. 1 it is complained of as a 'damnable custom' that

'no parson, abbot, nor other should have provision of any archbishopric or bishopric which shall be void till that he hath compounded with the Pope's Chamber to pay great and excessive sums of money, as well for the firstfruits of the same archbishopric or bishopric, as for other services in the same court,<sup>1</sup> and that the same sum, or the greater part thereof, be paid beforehand.'

This crushing exaction, falling especially heavily on clerks just at their promotion, and compelling them often to mortgage their sees to the Jews or the Lombard usurers, was an ingenious device of Pope John XXII.

'John XXII., Pope of Rome,' writes Gascoigne, 'procured these payments to the Roman See under pretence of delivering the Promised Land from the hands of the heathen, and afterwards these payments remained for the Pope's Chamber, to be distributed among the cardinals and chamberlains of the Pope and his officers, who are not slack in getting in the money, for if it be not forthcoming the Papal bulls which are now required for a bishop are refused, and the confirmation of his election is denied; so that almost all are now agreed that elections are useless, and certainly not without reason' (p. 34).

<sup>1</sup> In the Register of a bishop of the date 1452 the following Bulls are entered as having been received and paid for by the bishop, viz. Bulla Provisionis, Bulla Capitulo, Bulla Clero Lincoln., Bulla Populo Lincoln., Bulla Vasallis, Bulla ad recipiendum munus consecrationis (*Register of John Chedworth, Bishop of Lincoln*, MS. Lincoln Registry).

It is unnecessary to say that the annates and firstfruits formed only a small part of the funds extracted by the Pope from the English Church. In addition to these, and in addition also to the revenues of benefices and dignities conferred upon his courtiers, who were dispensed from residence, there were the constantly recurring levies of a fifteenth, a tenth, or even a fifth, in the pound of ecclesiastical revenue, which the King allowed to be gathered, on the understanding that the demands which he himself made on the clergy should not be opposed by the Pope. These levies, which had become rare during the period of the French wars and the Avignon Popes, had revived in full force under the kings of the House of Lancaster, whose policy it was to favour ultramontane pretensions. There was always, however, a spirit in the Church of England which prompted men to resist these external oppressive claims, and to take much lower views of the rights of the Pope over the Church of England than were popular at Rome. Among other instances of this to be found in the pages of Gascoigne we may specially note an account he gives of a prelate little known, Richard Praty, Bishop of Chichester.

'I know,' he writes, 'how the Bishop of Chichester, Master Richard Praty, excommunicated and deprived of his benefice a certain vicar of wicked life, and how the same vicar, after long vexing the Bishop in the Court of Arches, requested him, under heavy penalties, to absolve him from the sentence of excommunication by virtue of a power of absolution granted by Pope Eugenius to any suitable priest to absolve anyone connected with the Society of S. Anthony in London. But the Bishop would not do this, but deprived him of his vicarage, and would never, though requested by the Earl of Arundel and other great men, restore him to it, but drove him out of his diocese as an evil beast, saying, "This letter, which you say was granted to you by the Pope, is destructive of all the powers conceded by the Lord to the bishops; for from it it would follow that every ill-doer must be absolved by the bishop, will he nill he, or else the bishop must incur the censure of the Pope. Thus every bishop must absolve the most flagrant oppressor if he can only show the Pope's bull, without any other of the things needed for absolution before the Lord. It does not follow that I ought to absolve you because you have the Pope's bull, inasmuch as the Pope may both deceive and be deceived; for when the Pope hath said 'fiat,' his officers, drunk with the poison of avarice, alter bulls, both by increase and diminution, without the Pope's knowledge, to things which he has not conceded, and cannot concede, acceptably before God. Therefore I will not do according to your bull, both because I believe the Pope has not conceded this to you with his own mouth, and also because in effect he cannot concede it, inasmuch as power is given to him by Christ to bind that which is properly capable of being bound

by ma  
requir  
licens

T  
vexa  
eccle  
cipal  
the C  
mark  
in 14  
Lyon  
or ess  
of Ba  
famo  
Lyon  
day,  
this t

'T  
Unive  
elabor  
tion o  
The  
sat do

'T  
siderin  
Churc  
many  
able e  
michie

'1.  
and of

'2.  
should  
in dan

'3.  
or mor

'4.  
tion to

'5.  
when t

'6.  
receiv  
absent

'7.  
not rig

by man. . . . What sane person would affirm that every priest, when required, is bound to absolve anyone who has by a Papal bull the license to be absolved by any competent priest?" (p. 32).

The absolute paralysis of all discipline, caused by the vexatious interference of the Roman Curia at every turn in ecclesiastical life, was, throughout the Middle Age, the principal cause of the corruption and utter weakness into which the Church of England fell. We have already alluded to the marked similarity between the bitter complaints of Gascoigne in 1450 to those made by Bishop Grosseteste at the Council of Lyons exactly two hundred years before. Indeed, the sermon or essay printed in the *Liber Veritatum* on the 'Seven Streams of Babylon' bears a close resemblance to the great Bishop's famous sermon delivered before the Pope and Cardinals at Lyons. As a general *résumé* of all the crying scandals of the day, most of which had their origin and support in Rome, this tract well deserves attention. Mr. Rogers says—

'This is probably a *concio ad clerum*, a discourse addressed to the University, and is very instructive, not only as a specimen of an elaborate fifteenth-century sermon, but as a statement of the condition of the Church at the time in which it was composed.'

The sermon is on the text, 'By the streams of Babylon we sat down and wept when we remembered Sion.'

'The children,' says Gascoigne, 'of the heavenly Jerusalem, considering the evils which are to be found in the disorders of the Church, weep, because seven mighty evils, like seven streams, drown many in sins and punishments; from which seven streams innumerable evils, like rivulets from streams, are derived; and these most michievous streams are the following:—

- '1. The unworthy and wicked ordination of bishops, rectors, and officials, and their institution, which is called promotion.
- '2. The absence of a good rector from the people whom he should govern, which is like the absence of a sailor when the ship is in danger of sinking.
- '3. The plurality of churches or offices in one man, when two or more, as well qualified as the pluralist, would do more good.
- '4. The appropriation of tithes or churches, and their annexation to those who not the parish priests.
- '5. The abuse of absolution made by the voice of the priest when there is no true penitence or conversion from sins.
- '6. The abuse of indulgences, granted by men but not rightly received, because the necessary requirements in the sight of God are absent.
- '7. The abuse of dispensations or licenses granted by men, but not rightly used for the gain and salvation of souls.'

<sup>1</sup> Introduction, p. lxxxi.

Under the first head Gascoigne's denunciation of the state of things prevailing in the Church is very strong.

'Alas !' he says, 'how many patrons of churches and intruders of bishops and rectors, and of judges and officials, for their evil deeds in their evil ordinations of evil persons might say <sup>1</sup> to the erring and injured people of God, "By him whom we gave to you we made a gain of you." This sin of evil promotion is one which the Devil specially approves and procures, because by this neither are evil things destroyed nor hindered, nor are good works done which might be done. . . . Do thou, O Bishop, preach the things of the Lord to the people, and send others to preach, in spite of the statute put forth by Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, who, fearing ill preachers, ordained, with the other bishops, that none should preach who had not the license of the diocesan or metropolitan, or who had not the right by common law. And the same archbishop, before his death, was struck in his tongue, so that he could neither swallow nor speak for some days before his death, and he died thus, as is believed, because he thus bound the Word of God in the mouths of the preachers.<sup>2</sup> . . . Repent, O thou negligent rector, and do the first works.'

There was probably no more crying abuse in the fifteenth century than the ease with which the most unfit and worthless persons obtained orders. This was made a cause of formal complaint to the bishops in 1434 by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. They declare that in consequence of these easy admissions of persons without learning or morals the Universities were deserted, it being evident to all that a much shorter road was open to them into orders than that by learning and study.<sup>3</sup> The censures of both Archbishops Bouchier and Morton on the negligence of the clergy of their day are extremely severe.<sup>4</sup>

In enlarging upon the second head of mischief, viz. non-residence, Gascoigne mentions a curious argument which he had heard put forward in its defence.

"It is better," say some, "rarely to visit the flock than to reside with the flock continually ; for if the curate is continually resident too much familiarity with him breeds contempt, but if he is rarely at his cure then he will be more honoured as a stranger." Those who say this deceive themselves and hide the truth, and affirm that darkness is light. O Lord God, grant that those who are placed over churches may come down humbly and compassionately from their too exalted state to speak with and humbly to attend to the

<sup>1</sup> Alluding to 2 Cor. xii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> It is singular to find Gascoigne giving currency to this Lollard fancy, inasmuch as he has no sympathy for the Lollards. It does not appear that Arundel took any more than fair precautions against unlicensed preachers.

<sup>3</sup> Wilkins, *Concil.* iii. 528-30.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 574, 619.



needs of those placed under them, who now dare not to approach them, nor to tell the needs of their soul and body to their spiritual fathers, because they are so far off and so highly placed. . . . But perhaps it may be said, "I have a good substitute, and therefore I don't care about my absence from my cure." Know, however, that he who performs the work of his cure by another does not perform it himself, except there be a necessity and a desire to do the work were it possible. And he who acts by a vicar withdraws the vicar himself from good works which he might perform were the incumbent himself rightly to perform his duties.'

Pluralities, the third stream of Babylon, is a 'mighty drowner of virtues.' Pluralists may be well called devourers and destroyers of salvation and of worship, standing in the way of good men, taking the places usurped, and using what was intended for Divine purposes for their own pleasure and fleshly delights.

'Nor can any such have an easy conscience by means of a Papal dispensation, because the Pope in his judgment often deceives and is deceived, and although, overcome by importunity, he may license you to hold two incompatible benefices, he cannot rightly license you to do so, because perhaps you seek the license from mere love of ease and pleasure, and have no design to perform the will of God, and therefore you are using the Pope's license to your own damnation' (p. 69).

The appropriation of churches, the fourth stream of Babylon, is the cause of the destruction of the clergy and the falling short of students and the penury of those employed in the work of the ministry:—

'Alas! alas! what sort of things are now supported and multiplied by the appropriations of churches. Truly in many places the multiplication of feasts, and of lawyers, and of merely temporal business, and the support of great men and oppressors, to whom the others truckle in matters where they do wrong lest they should lose their goods. . . . Formerly kings had in the monasteries founded by them illustrious writers of the books of great doctors and of chronicles; but, alas! now books are rather destroyed and lost among the religious than written afresh. . . . The whole Council of Basle sought throughout the world for one book, very necessary for their purposes, concerning the doings in the times of the Apostles, and there could not be found one perfect copy in the monasteries. What great advantages might arise from these churches. But, alas! the rectors and preachers sit down to eat and to drink and rise up to play. So that a mighty amount of good works is hindered by the appropriation and annexation of churches. It were better that a fitting provision should be made for the pastoral care, and then that annual payments should be made to good and devout religious bodies from the rich churches (but not that these should be appropriated to the religious

bodies and the provision of the pastoral care left to them). Truly the deficiencies in the requisite pastoral care call aloud for judgment on the head of the appropriators.'

Gascoigne frequently enlarges upon this abuse of the appropriation of churches by the monasteries. Sometimes, he says, it is due to the selfish act of some great man who wishes to have forty or fifty persons to pray for his soul rather than one; but, in the opinion of the writer, the prayers of the one to whom the tithes properly belong are more valuable than those of the religious community who have robbed the parish of its rights. He specially dwells upon the fact that this appropriation of tithes by the religious houses hinders the sending of youths to the Universities by rectors of parishes. He records the fact that he had known no less than twenty young men sent by one parish for education at Oxford. So portentous had the abuse of appropriations become that Gascoigne exclaims:—

'The time is coming in England when it will be said, "Formerly there were rectors in England, but now the churches are ruined, so that educated men cannot live upon them and help others to get them education"' (p. 149).

There is probably not one monkish chronicle of the many now accessible which would not demonstrate the fact that the one paramount object of religious bodies in the Middle Age was to obtain the appropriations of churches. From the time of the Lateran Council of 1179 the bishops were able to compel the assignment of a fixed sum by the appropriator for the work of the parish and the appointment of a vicar. This sum appears to have been generally about a third of the glebe and tithe of the parish, together with the *altaragium*, or altar dues. When there was no vicar, the whole revenue of the church went to the monastery, which provided for the cure by one of its members, of course without expense. It is needless to remark that such appropriations were just as mischievous to the parish as a purely lay appropriation, which was also very common, and that both of them have left a legacy of trouble and mischief to the Church of England.

'The fifth stream of Babylon,' writes Gascoigne, 'which destroys many souls, is the abuse of the sacrament of penance, and the false confidence which leads men to believe that they can have true pardon of sin and of eternal punishment from God by the absolution of the priest, although they have not true penitence before God, nor real turning away from their sins, nor true turning of the will to good works. . . . Would that the penitent would understand what good works one is bound to perform by the Divine judgment, although

no pri  
not n  
enjoin  
espec  
under  
they v  
hand  
as if I

O  
Pope's  
obser  
the P  
power  
says—

'In  
and to  
Magda  
Paul i  
cient u  
fathers  
penite

But w  
absolu  
the bo  
horrib  
few pe  
sinful

Th  
abuse  
the Po

'O  
great r  
men ne  
done.  
than th  
dispens  
good o  
anyone  
of posi  
in such  
the Lor  
thou co  
sentenc  
that Th  
in man  
licenses

no priest on the earth imposes such acts upon him. Then he would not merely pay attention to the arbitrary penance which the priest enjoins, to which he is not bound except the priest enjoin it, but especially to those things which the Lord enjoins by the light of his understanding or by the sacred Scriptures. . . . Oh, how foolish are they who say, "I care not what I do, because if the priest put his hand on my head and say, I absolve thee, I shall be safe, and as clean as if I were licked by cats" (p. 78).

Of the sixth stream of Babylon—false confidence in the Pope's indulgences—we have already spoken. It must be observed that Gascoigne by no means denied the power of the Pope to grant indulgences any more than he denied the power of the priest to give absolution. On the contrary, he says—

'Indulgence is a true and precious thing, and highly to be prized, and to be bought at such a price as that holy lover of Christ Mary Magdalene bought it. An instance of indulgence is shown by S. Paul in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, when he says, "Sufficient unto such a man is this punishment." It is the custom of the fathers of the Church to grant indulgences to those who are truly penitent, who confess and make satisfaction.'

But what he condemns so strongly in this case, as in that of absolution, is the *opus operatum* theory that a man can have the benefit of indulgence simply by buying a paper, and the horrible profanation which sold these spiritual sentences for a few pence, a cup of ale, a game at ball, or even for an act of sinful sensuality.

The seventh and last of the streams of Babylon is the abuse of dispensations and licenses, whether obtained from the Pope or from English bishops :—

'Of old time, in the days of the holy doctor Augustine, there was great recourse to the Pope of Rome to enquire of him and the wise men near him whether a thing were lawful to be done or not to be done. They rather enquired of the Pope whether a thing were lawful, than that it might be made lawful. For the holy fathers knew that dispensation or licensing of man did not cause an act in itself to be good or bad. . . . The dispensation or licensing of the Pope or of anyone who has power to dispense takes away the human prohibition of positive law. . . . But the Pope cannot give license for men to act in such a manner as many do, upholding grievous abuses. . . . For the Lord said unto Peter, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common," that is, Be thy sentence, O Peter, conformable to the sentence of God.' 'O Lord God!' he prays in another place, 'grant that Thy vicar, the lord Pope, may see how many mighty evils follow in many places and abbeys from privileges granted to them, and licenses, and especially in cathedral churches in which the deans and

prebendaries will not obey their bishop and will not be visited by him nor corrected, alleging some perverse custom to the contrary, or some Papal privileges granted to them, which are the cause of many evils. There was lately an abbot who obtained privilege of exemption against his bishop by the payment of twenty marks annually to the Pope, and to make this payment and another to the King he appropriated a large parish church. . . . We have seen boys and worthless creatures promoted and exalted to bishoprics, abbacies, deaneries, archdeaconries, valuable prebends, and churches, while men of experience and learning and of the highest degree are excluded and lead the life of paupers, having no church nor pastoral care, while boys of twelve or fourteen years old have lately obtained the Papal license to be canons and rectors in great churches' (p. 131).

'Alas !' exclaims the Doctor, 'what evils flow forth and what good things are destroyed by these seven streams of Babylonian confusion ; separate churches, "like a lodge in a garden of cucumbers," are left deserted of care and guidance ; everywhere sons of Belial are appointed to churches and great offices, being intruded by threats, by gifts, or by carnal favouritism ; prelates, by means of provisions, disregarding the elections of chapters, through bribes obtain the power of destroying holy places and the cure of souls. . . . How many religious have been taken away from their habit and profession, and made curates or chaplains ! How many kings and nobles have made violent assaults on ecclesiastical things by privileges and dispensations, and licenses to decline the services of their own pastor, so that now often the fornicator seeks out a confessor guilty of the same sin, and anyone guilty of a great crime looks for a priest whose life has been stained with the same, or perhaps seeks one who does not dare to speak the necessary truths to him, and thus the fear of offending God has left many, and there is no shame for sin ! O Lord God, who didst make the dry land appear in the waters, and didst make a way in the Red Sea, grant that by the operation of Thy Spirit these miserable streams of Babylon may be dried up, and that Thy people, returning from the captivity of sin, may give Thee true praise for ever in the heavenly Sion and in Jerusalem' (p. 99).

From these extracts the tone of Gascoigne's mind may be estimated, and his judgment on the religious and ecclesiastical state of his day may be seen. The same sentiments, generally more strongly expressed, are repeated over and over again in his work, the tautology of which is something marvellous. But Gascoigne is far from confining his censures to general denunciations of abuses and shortcomings. These Jeremiads on the 'wounds of the Church' may be found in almost every age of the Church. The peculiarity of this censor of the fifteenth century is that he does not hesitate to hold up by name to deserved opprobrium the principal ill-doers, not shrinking even from attacking the highest placed, some of whom were certainly alive when his book was written.

The  
Bis  
at O  
anti  
tract  
again  
and  
Wha  
prea  
view  
the b  
had  
invol  
mons  
instr  
migh  
need  
sums  
We h  
used  
we kn  
cited  
oblig  
sente  
was b  
could  
man,  
lowed  
bress  
more  
Pecoc  
Pecoc  
the or  
a thin  
sions  
of do  
afterw  
a plac  
the pr  
Churc  
of co-  
a supr  
decla  
to hol  
suffer

The first and principal malefactor of his age was, in his view, Bishop Reginald Pecock. He had known Pecock personally at Oriel, and had evidently taken some deeply-rooted personal antipathy to him. Something like twenty times in the extracts published by Mr. Rogers does he return to the charge against this obnoxious divine, heaping censure upon censure and almost exhausting the vocabulary of orthodox abuse. What was the foundation for all this? Pecock had, in 1447, preached a sermon which had attracted much attention. In view of the terrible unpopularity which at that time attended the bishops, and the attacks to which they were subjected, he had maintained that the episcopal office did not of necessity involve any greater obligation on the bishop to preach sermons than the priestly office involved. The bishop might instruct by other ways, and be occupied with other duties. He might, for important reasons, be absent from his diocese. He need not be held guilty of simony if he paid to the Pope the sums which had become customary as annates and firstfruits. We have no means of knowing what were the exact terms used by the Bishop in handling these very delicate topics, but we know that his endeavour to apologize for his brethren excited a storm of fury in the lay mind. The Archbishop was obliged to order his trial, and though he escaped an adverse sentence he was somewhat roughly handled. Gascoigne, who was bitterly incensed against the negligent lives of the bishops, could not forgive Pecock, who was a very able and dexterous man, this defence of them; and when, two years later, he followed up his sermon by an elaborate work called *The Repressor of Over-much Blaming of the Clergy*, his anger was still more increased. But this was not the only offence of Bishop Pecock in the eyes of the orthodox Chancellor of Oxford. Pecock was, in fact, almost the only theologian of his day, and the only man really acquainted with Church history. He was a thinker, a man of a candid mind, and he arrived at conclusions with regard to the power of the Church, and the relations of doctrine to Scripture and Fathers, very similar to those afterwards so ably defended by Richard Hooker. He claimed a place for reason in the settlement of doctrine and limiting the province of authority, and, insisting on the fallibility of the Church, he denied that opinions of doctors could be ranked as of co-ordinate force with Holy Scripture, to which he assigns a supreme place. He advocated a fair spirit of inquiry, and declared that 'it was a shameful thing for the Christian Church to hold such a faith for substance of salvation, and yet not to suffer it to be examined; it were imputing a villany to Christ

that would give such a faith to His people, with which faith He would His people should turn all other people, and yet would not allow His faith to be full tried.' Advocating this right of inquiry, Pecock was of course opposed to persecution on account of religion. He would depend on argument, and by this he endeavoured to convince the Lollards. His treatises were written in English, which was one of the chief causes of the indignation excited against him, ending, as is well known, in his condemnation for heresy and lifelong imprisonment. Very full details of his trial and treatment are to be found in Gascoigne, but the animus of the writer is so bitter that we must receive them with caution. It is hard to say which offends him most, Pecock's somewhat rash defence of the clergy or his disparagement of the paramount authority of S. Jerome or S. Augustine. He seems to have allowed Pecock no credit whatever for his labours against the Lollards, though these, too, were hateful in the eyes of the Chancellor. Some interesting details are given about Peter Payn, or Clerk, as he styled himself, the Lollard Apostle of Bohemia. Peter was born at Hough-on-the-Hill, near Grantham. He was a Frenchman by family and became distinguished at Oxford. According to Gascoigne he was 'a very great rogue, and contrived to steal the common seal of the University, under which he wrote to the heretics of Prague that Oxford and all England was of the faith of those of Prague, with the single exception of the mendicant friars' (p. 20). Of Wycliffe there is not much new information to be found in Gascoigne. Of course he calls him a 'heretic' and an 'evil doctor,' but he does not indulge in the same violent abuse of him to be found in other chroniclers, and it is probable that he had some sympathy with him as a protester against the ecclesiastical abuses of his day. One of the orthodox opponents of Pecock was George Nevile, Bishop of Exeter, afterwards Archbishop of York. Gascoigne tells us of the crying scandal attaching to this prelate. Being the son of the Earl of Salisbury, he was licensed by the Pope at the age of twenty-three to receive the revenues of the see of Exeter, though he was allowed to defer his consecration till he was twenty-seven. This thing, he says, will be a 'scandal to posterity.' Another scandalous entrance into the episcopate is mentioned by Gascoigne. A certain incompetent priest had paid Pope Eugenius 1,400 marks for the provision to a deanery, and the King had ratified this. But when the vacancy occurred the man was so incompetent that the chapter refused to receive him and elected another. To compromise matters and hush up the quarrel the incompetent clerk was made a

bishop  
might  
to lea  
again  
bitter  
sorene  
raised  
asked  
singu  
Gasco  
he wo  
scient  
not be  
in En  
but it  
stories  
Bere,  
by his  
them  
reform  
'abom  
declin  
lose 4  
clergy  
was on  
if the  
of the  
clergy  
Certain  
a bish  
payme  
terbur  
dioces  
bency  
and of  
ruin, s  
archbi  
dered  
a pay  
Bishop  
rebelli  
duties

<sup>1</sup> Th  
of St. D



*bishop*, 'and thus,' says Gascoigne, 'to avoid a small evil a mighty mischief was done, and a blind bishop was ordained to lead a blind people into the ditch' (p. 26).<sup>1</sup> The charges against bishops in Gascoigne's work are so frequent and so bitter that we cannot help suspecting that there was some soreness in the Chancellor's mind that he himself had not been raised to the mitre. He tells us that King Henry VI. once asked him at Windsor why he was not a bishop (a somewhat singular question to come from the source of patronage). Gascoigne's answer was, that as things were now in England he would rather make money as a good tailor than as the most scientific of doctors. In another place he says that he does not believe that since 1403 there has been a single good bishop in England. These expressions are evidently exaggerated, but it must be confessed that the Doctor has some very ugly stories to tell of bishops. For instance, he tells us that De la Bere, Bishop of St. David's, was, in the year 1452, requested by his clergy to compel their concubines, who were living with them in their houses, to leave them, they being desirous to reform their ways and the ladies refusing to depart. The 'abominable' Bishop, as Gascoigne calls him, is said to have declined to make this order, for, he said, if he did so he should lose 400 marks a year which he obtained for licenses to the clergy to keep concubines. The price of a license, it seems, was one noble. This sounds very bad in the Bishop; but what if the persons stigmatized as concubines were the lawful wives of the clergy, as was probably the case, a large number of the clergy all through the Middle Ages having been married men? Certainly even in this case it would be scandalous enough for a bishop to allow what was held to be unlawful for a money payment. Kemp, successively Archbishop of York and Canterbury, is charged by Gascoigne with not having visited the diocese of York during the twenty-eight years of his incumbency more than two or three times for a few weeks at a time, and of having let the buildings belonging to the see fall into utter ruin, so that the palace nearly fell to the ground. This same archbishop is also charged in another place with having ordered that no absolution should be given to anyone without a payment being made towards the fabric of York Minster. Bishop Askew, who met with so tragical a fate in the Cade rebellion, is charged with having scandalously neglected the duties of his office as confessor to King Henry VI. at the same

<sup>1</sup> The deanery was Wells. The incompetent bishop was De la Bere of St. David's, of whom we shall give a remarkable anecdote.

time that he left his diocese altogether without care that he might reside at Court. Archbishop Booth is said to be an absolute ignoramus, and to be as lacking in character as he was in acquirements. Bouchier, Bishop of Ely, is accused of grievous covetousness, injustice, and neglect of duty. But the most terrible indictment of all is brought against Archbishop Stafford, which we give in Gascoigne's own words :—

'In my days, in the year of our Lord 1443, there was elected, or rather intruded, an archbishop who was born in manifest adultery, and, being a bishop, begat sons and daughters of a nun before he was archbishop, and was yet described as "elected by the Holy Spirit" in a bull which the Pope issued *before* the day of election' (p. 231).

In addition to such scandals as these there was the general prevalence of secular employment among the prelates, which was very displeasing to Gascoigne. Stafford, Archbishop of Canterbury, and after him Kemp and Bouchier were Chancellors of England. The Bishop of Chichester was Keeper of the Privy Seal; the Bishop of Norwich was the Queen's confessor residing at Court; the Bishop of Carlisle, and afterwards of Lincoln, was Treasurer; the Bishop of Coventry was chancellor to Queen Margaret.

'I knew a bishop,' says Gascoigne, 'lately dead, who left in his treasury eight thousand marks, and this man was never in his episcopal church nor in his diocese after that he was made bishop, but lived in London at his ease; and I know now four great bishops occupied in temporal matters away from their dioceses, and two who are constantly resident at Court' (p. 189).

It was this neglect and non-residence of the prelates which, according to Gascoigne, was a principal cause of the Cade rebellion. He says—

'The commons of England rose up against the ecclesiastics in the year 1450 because the bishops and their rectors did not reside on their cures, but in the palace of the King or in lords' houses; also because they did not maintain hospitality; also because they did not preach by word and holy example; also because they were steeped in sin, and in riches and luxury; also because justice and the correction of sin had ceased. Also the plurality of benefices and the appropriation of parish churches and the purchase of benefices were chief causes, as they said, of their insurrection at that time in the kingdom of England' (p. 43).

The fact that the principal cause of the rising of the commons was the starving condition of the masses in the miserably misgoverned country, where a king of feeble in-

telled  
not  
appro  
and  
facto  
doub  
Reck  
600  
estab  
the a  
of th  
periza  
of ar  
comm  
Henc  
the c  
side,  
murde  
fact, t  
so th  
popul  
in the  
istic o  
fifteen  
Churc  
and a  
protes  
passed  
Gasco  
who s

'N  
our bis  
bishop  
his own  
not exp

Me  
charac  
there i

'Th  
and a g  
in sinfu  
servants  
pretend  
murder

tellest was served by wretchedly incompetent ministers, does not altogether invalidate this statement; for, indeed, the appropriation of the tithes of churches to the monasteries, and the non-residence of incumbents, were very important factors in the prevailing misery. The monasteries, which no doubt dispensed considerable alms, were few and far between. Reckoning large and small, there were at no time more than 600 in England, and they were almost entirely country establishments, often situated in very secluded spots, so that the alms they gave had but little effect on the larger masses of the population. These suffered directly from the depauperization of their parish churches, and from the alteration of arable to pasture land, which the high price of wool recommended to the more astute management of the monks. Hence the outbreak of terrible fury against the Church and the cry of 'Woe to the bishops!' which resounded on every side, and which was fearfully emphasized by the savage murders of Bishops Moleyns and Askew. It needed not, in fact, the special cases of clerical scandals which are scattered so thickly through the pages of Gascoigne to arouse the popular discontent. These, no doubt, had always existed in the society of the Middle Age. But the special characteristic of the state of feeling in England in the middle of the fifteenth century seems to have been that the *laches* of the Church produced a general feeling of revolt from all religion and a tendency to scoff at its claims. The spirit of religious protest which appears in the poem of *Piers Plowman* had passed into a hard and bitter feeling, such as is put by Gascoigne into the mouth of the parishioners of a church, who said—

'Now we believe that adultery is no sin, for if it were a sin our bishop would have deprived our rector of his cure, because the bishop knows that the rector was openly discovered in adultery with his own parishioner, the wife of another man, and yet the bishop did not expel him from that cure' (p. 24).

Men might even think that murder of a most atrocious character was a venial offence in the eyes of the Church, if there is truth in a story which Gascoigne tells.

'There was a priest,' he says, 'who was rector of two churches and a graduate of laws, who first of all kept for a long time a woman in sinful union, and afterwards caused her to marry one of his servants, and then, when they quarrelled, hired three persons, who pretended to be scholars, to murder the husband; and they did murder him, the rector looking on and laughing while they did it.

And this man gave 40*l.* to the bishop, and 20*l.* to an abbot, and 40*l.* to a knight, to get his pardon from the King' (p. 220).

While some, therefore, laughed and bought an indulgence for twopence or a draught of ale, others, more serious, were bitterly incensed against the whole system : and it is probable that the murderous outbreaks which took place in Bohemia would have been repeated in England, had not the breaking out and long continuance of the Wars of the Roses found another occupation for the discontented spirits. Gascoigne is so occupied with his earnest protests against ecclesiastical scandals that we do not find, at least in the printed extracts, many illustrations of the customs of the day, or many contributions to contemporary history. Some there are, however, which are worth noting, as when he asserts that both Alexander V. and Eugenius IV. were poisoned by their cardinals (p. 154). Of this body the Oxford Chancellor has the very worst opinion. 'If the Pope does not grant all that they want,' he says, 'they will insult him and raise up enemies against him, and labour to depose him or to poison him' (p. 146). He tells a shocking story of one Thomas de Calva, a Carmelite friar, who preached at Rome in the time of Eugenius IV. against the abuses of the Pope's Court and the cardinals and their simoniacal practices. Two cardinals, he says, hearing of his sermon, declared him to be a heretic and caused him to be burned to ashes ; and these two cardinals, whose names he gives, quickly met with terrible ends, one being found dead in his bed, and the other having become a raving madman, finishing his days in a madhouse the same year in which Brother Thomas was burned (p. 171). Among customs prevailing in the England of his day noted by Gascoigne may be mentioned the extreme indecency of the dress in fashion in his time, the custom of using ribald songs at Christmas, and the general habit of profane swearing by the person and limbs and wounds of Christ. He tells us that in 1457 many persons died of a strange hæmorrhage, blood breaking out from their eyes, their mouths, their ears, and that this was generally held to be a judgment for the prevalence of this profane habit. Of the Oxford of his day, of which Gascoigne was so competent to speak, he gives but a very poor account, both as to its morality and its learning. The regents, he declares, openly sold graces for degrees. The disputations and sermons were altogether frivolous and contemptible, until Doctor Richard Flemyng, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, introduced a salutary reform, which Gascoigne explains at great length, but not very clearly. The

refe  
ma  
for  
whi  
siti  
the

coig  
able  
valu  
No  
ofte  
an  
was  
any  
teen  
Eng  
imp  
volu  
men  
mov  
of th  
shak  
This  
conn  
and  
don,  
soon  
follow  
no h  
Lolla  
more  
rising  
be sw  
shaki  
we se  
and  
about  
distor  
called  
which  
into v  
season  
his s  
notion  
VOI

reform appears to have consisted in doing away with logomachies and quibbles on the words of a text, and in putting forth at the beginning of a sermon four heads or propositions which the preacher undertook to establish, the four propositions corresponding with the subjects of the four books of the Sentences.

While unable to give quite so high a character to Gascoigne's utterances as is claimed for them in Mr. Rogers' able Introduction, we must again point to their very great value as illustrating the ecclesiastical England of his day. No doubt the writer was somewhat childish in his views, and often petulant in his utterances, never being able to forego an opportunity of a cut at Pecock or Bernyngham; but he was clearly an honest and well-informed man; and should any apology be needed for the drastic measures of the sixteenth century, which revolutionized the attitude of the English Church towards Rome, and introduced many other important changes, we could point with confidence to this volume as a complete justification of the reforming movement. It must be admitted that the Wycliffite and Lollard movement had done very little for the practical improvement of the Church in the fifteenth century. Its mission was to shake and upheave the old mediæval system, not to construct. This it was not competent to do. Wycliffe was the sole man connected with that movement who was both a theologian and in earnest. His followers at Oxford—Hertford, Repyngdon, Ashton, Bedeman—were dialecticians who recanted as soon as their opinions became dangerous. His country followers, Swinderby, Purveye, and others, were men who did no honour to the cause of reform. Some at least of the Lollard preachers encouraged communistic views, and were more or less mixed up in the Wat Tyler and Jack Cade risings. Before the long accretions of mediævalism could be swept away there was needed this revolutionary period of shaking and movement. But during the continuance of it we see the mischiefs destined to be removed in the worst and most repulsive light. They are cut adrift and tossed about in an ocean of disturbance, so that their outlines are distorted and their proportions lost. Attention is rudely called to apparent enormities, while the general condition which existed before these enormities were thrust forward into view is forgotten. Gascoigne wrote his book during this season of change and upheaval, and hence it is possible that his severe censures may give somewhat an exaggerated notion of the evils of the Church in his day. But after

making these deductions the picture is still portentous. We search almost in vain for the redeeming points. There is scarcely a gleam of light. All is confusion, greed, indolence, selfishness, licentiousness. The land was to pass through a bitter expiation on the hundred battle-fields of the Wars of the Roses, and then should come a time of more light.

#### ART. VII.—THE FAILURE OF VATICANISM.

1. *Le Christ, le Pape et la Démocratie.* Par l'Abbé ROCA. (Paris, 1884.)
2. *Le Grand Pêril de l'Eglise de France au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* Par M. l'Abbé BOUGAUD. (Paris, 1878.)
3. *Pourquoi le Clergé Français est Ultramontain.* Par plusieurs Ecclésiastiques très Catholiques mais Patriotes. (Paris, 1879.)
4. *La Nuova Italia ed i Vecchi Zelanti.* Dal Sac. C. M. CURCI. (Firenze, 1881.)
5. *Il Vaticano Regio.* Dal Sac. C. M. CURCI. (Firenze-Roma, 1883.)
6. *Converts to Rome.* Compiled by W. GORDON-GORMAN. (London, 1884.)
7. *The Present State of the Church in England.* By Lord BRAYE. (London, 1884.)
8. *The Spectre of the Vatican.* (London, N.D.)
9. *Catholicity in its Relationship to Protestantism and Romanism.* By the Rev. F. C. EWER. (New York, 1878.)
10. *The Priest in Politics.* By the late P. J. SMYTH, M.P. (Dublin, 1885.)

TWO contrasted movements marked the close of the eighteenth century, itself the era of reasonable commonplace, wearied with the controversies of the two immediately preceding ages. They were the French Revolution and the revival of Romanticism in literature. At a first glance there seems no comparison at all between their relative importance, so vast is the scale on which the former operated from its beginning, and so insignificant seem the results achieved, even from the purely literary point of view, by the little group of antiquaries, poets, and novelists who revolted from the tyranny of classicism. And yet they absolutely complement



one another, nor can either be so much as understood without bringing them together for comparison; while it may be doubted if the Romanticists have not affected modern society rather more of the two.

They were alike in being reactions against the complacent self-esteem of the last century, which surpassed our own time in that quality, since, not content with regarding itself as the perfection of wisdom (a temper not obsolete with its successor), it felt and expressed the profoundest contempt for the past, and would not allow that any of its own acquirements were due to the labours of earlier days. They agreed in breaking down the ideas which they found in possession; and though the one attempted to sweep away the whole of the past, and to blot out its very memory, while the other, contrariwise, aimed at bringing back into living use much which had been so long forgotten as to be reputed dead, yet their joint efforts made for the same end, the reconstruction of the whole framework of social order.

The share of the Romanticists in this work, at any rate in Germany and England, was chiefly in the religious sphere, though little thought of the kind had presented itself to the pioneers of the movement. Yet the sequence is clear. The dominant classicism was inherently pagan, and was the child of the Pagan Renaissance of the fifteenth century; Romanticism had to go for its ideas, its literature, its monuments, to the Middle Ages, which were Christian in all their finest and loftiest products, and thus it inevitably brought in religious notions in the train of those merely secular ones with which it was at first concerned. Here, in England, the true beginning of the Oxford movement was the publication of Bishop Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* in 1765, which, amongst other less notable effects, set Horace Walpole at his tentative revival of Gothic architecture—regarded as barbarous from the Revolution downwards—and decided the bent of Walter Scott's genius, which, by making the Middle Ages live again for us in poem and romance, quickened all sympathy in that direction. The movement was later in Germany, for the founder of Romanticism there, August Wilhelm von Schlegel, was not born till two years after Percy's *Reliques* appeared. But, on the other hand, the German movement was consciously mixed up with theology from the first, being largely a reaction from the prevalent rationalism of the time. Now, as every student of European history knows, there is nothing in the whole period of the Middle Ages which looms half so large as the Latin Church. It per-

vades every place, is bound up with every interest; the whole literature of the time, all but the whole of the art, whatever was progressive and methodized in agriculture, the higher walks of politics, the chivalrous side of war, the ceremonies that held together the guilds and sodalities which monopolized the infant manufactures and commerce of Europe, all spring from, or are associated with, the great Church whose visible head was throned above monarchs and was the recognized arbiter of Christendom. Consequently it was inevitable that the Romanticist movement should also be to some extent one in the direction of Rome, less from conscious theological sympathy than from the golden haze through which the students of mediævalism viewed it. On the Continent, moreover, there was another influence at work in the same direction—namely, reaction from the Jacobin Revolution of 1792, which had destroyed the fair promise of 1789. The Terror, with its atheism, its reckless destruction of everything that had a dignified past, its menace to society at large, induced men to turn to the Roman Church as the greatest statical and anti-revolutionary power visible in the world; and the recognition, on the part of keen philosophical thinkers, that the Revolution itself was but the second act of the drama whose first act was the Luthero-Calvinist Reformation, disposed them all the more to look favourably on the great society which Luther and Calvin sought to overthrow. The immunity of England from revolution, the long-standing prejudice against Roman Catholicism which the Marian persecution and the absolutist follies of James II. had established, made the process much later here; but it was bound to come some time or other, and it did come in the early course of the Oxford movement, when its leaders had just discovered those faults in the Church of England and those merits in the Church of Rome to which education and hereditary habit had previously made them blind.

Not only were such causes at work in the minds of outsiders, but the process going on within the Roman Church itself was not less calculated to rehabilitate it amongst its own adherents, and to win respect from aliens. The Revolution, in the very act of destroying much which was venerable and useful, also swept away even more which had been a permanent source of scandal and unpopularity. In France the whole race of dissolute abbés, titular ecclesiastics who brought discredit on the Church under Louis XIV., the Regency, and Louis XV., vanished altogether; the monasteries which had become odious from the feudal privileges that made them

opp  
too  
of t  
in th  
Ger  
tora  
evil  
was  
Lati  
thre  
to s  
to c  
stan  
vinc  
cipli  
the  
bring  
teach  
exist  
chur  
as th  
stand  
post  
spirit  
have  
unde  
less s  
new m  
in th  
The  
much  
auth  
the r  
ened,  
Germ  
many  
some  
negat  
reviva  
conce  
merel  
Churc  
severa  
in a d  
Pope,

oppressive landlords, and from the low moral reputation of too many amongst them, were suppressed; the huge revenues of the greater prelates, too often squandered in luxury and in the rivalries of the Court, had been confiscated; while in Germany the prince-bishoprics, and notably the three electorates of Mainz, Trèves, and Cologne, which had done much evil to religion, were secularized, and a simpler mode of life was forced upon the later tenants of those great sees. The Latin clergy almost everywhere, seeing how they were threatened by the advance of the Revolution, were compelled to set their house in order, to remove causes of offence, and to carry out a multitude of practical reforms which raised the standard of clerical character and efficiency. Further, convinced as they were that only the most united front and disciplined order would enable them to hold their own against the enemies who threatened them, they set themselves to bring about a much greater degree of uniformity in doctrinal teaching, and even in ritual details, than had previously existed, naturally taking the local rules of the Roman churches and schools as their model; while, lastly, the Jesuits, as the ablest and best organized corps in the Church, as well as standing highest in moral reputation, were entrusted with the post of leadership, and held in their hands virtually the whole spiritual guidance of Germany, France, and Italy. No men have ever seen more clearly for a short distance, or have better understood how to work for a near end, and they were hardly less successful in adapting themselves and their pupils to the new requirements of the time than they had shown themselves in the Counter-Reformation more than two centuries earlier. The net result was that the Latin Church, though shorn of much of its wealth and pomp, and deprived also of the secular authority it had wielded in several countries, emerged from the revolutionary era to all appearance purified and strengthened, and with every prospect of new conquests, especially in Germany, where the spiritual collapse of Lutheranism set many devout minds in quest of some more durable system, some creed which did not logically lead so plainly to mere negations. And one peculiarity which ran all through the revival in every country where it manifested itself, was the concentration of force, the centralization of authority, not merely by the more hierarchical form taken by the local Churches, but by the increasing tendency to abolish their several national peculiarities and liberties, and to submit them, in a degree previously unknown, to the direct authority of the Pope, or, more exactly, of the Jesuits, of whom it was never

more true that they were 'a sword whose hilt is at Rome, and whose point is everywhere.' All this tended necessarily to make the Papacy, as distinct from the Roman Catholic creed, assume larger dimensions in the imagination of both friends and foes, and so to exercise a powerful fascination over those numerous minds which are swayed by mass, by dignity, and by strong assertion. It is unnecessary to discuss the tokens of weakness which the imposing fabric soon began to display, to dwell on the story of Hermes in Germany or of Lamennais in France, and it suffices to place the general situation before the reader, that he may see under what favourable conditions the attempt of the Roman Church not only to hold its own against the encroachments of scepticism, but to reconquer long-lost territories, was begun within living memory. Steadily, all through the reigns of Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., Gregory XVI., and above all, Pius IX., the Jesuit theories were being translated into practice, centralization was gradually drawn tighter, and the edifice so many centuries in preparation was crowned at last by the proclamation in the Vatican Council of the Pope's personal infallibility and immediate jurisdiction in all dioceses of the Roman obedience. The intellectual incapacity of Pius IX., and the policy of repression to which he devoted himself after his return from Gaeta, whereof the famous Syllabus of Errors, issued in 1864, may be taken as the formal exponent, made it impracticable for him to wield effectively the weapons which had been put into his hands, and his long reign is more noticeable for the extraordinary development of novel cults than for any other religious product. But with the advent to power of a Pope like Leo XIII.—learned, in contrast with his all but illiterate predecessor; reticent, after the most loquacious of Pontiffs; calm and temperate, instead of excitable and vacillating; a man of the world in the good sense of that phrase, instead of a mere child in all that concerns practical action—a marked change was to be looked for, and that one far exceeding the mere relaxation of tension within the Roman Church itself, which it has certainly brought with it, to the unspeakable relief of many minds, for which the situation had become well-nigh intolerable. He has now been seven years in possession of the Papal chair, and it is time to examine the position in which he finds himself. By his tact and moderation he has avoided precipitating the open quarrel between Church and State in France which would almost certainly have broken out had Pius IX. lived to deal with the same circumstances; he has put an end to the *Kulturkampf* in Germany; he has to some extent liber-

aliz  
sive  
the  
reb  
Irel  
inte  
and  
reha  
Pius  
wid  
atio  
fairl  
at th  
Chu  
the  
were

and  
mor  
The  
luti  
itself  
truth  
decl  
ciple  
press  
spon  
forth  
a de  
one  
and  
the V  
Libe  
faith  
and  
social  
rever  
for it  
small  
that  
even  
tical  
Bord  
d'Aze  
Hirsc

alized the College of Cardinals, and made it far less exclusively Italian ; he has checked the fanaticism of Ultramontanes themselves in France and Belgium ; he has spoken words of rebuke to the disloyal Roman Catholic bishops and priests in Ireland ; he has refused to take action against more than one intended victim of the zealots who tried to force his hand ; and by all this, and more which must be omitted here, he has rehabilitated the Papacy in that general respect from which Pius IX. had effectively pulled it down. But what of the wider question, as to the progress of the new Counter-Reformation, from which so much was expected, and even seemed fairly likely to come to pass ? What is the Roman outlook at this moment in any of the ancient territories of the Latin Church, or those non-Roman lands where, as in England and the United States, visions of wide, if not universal, proselytism were entertained ?

The materials for answering this question are abundant and accessible, and the reply they furnish could scarcely be more unfavourable to Roman Catholic hopes and prophecies. The initial difficulty is that in declaring war against the Revolution, as Pius VI. did in 1791, the Roman Curia pledged itself to much more than opposition to Jacobinism, which in truth had not then risen upon the political horizon. The declaration of hostilities embraced nearly all the main principles upon which modern society is based—liberty of the press, liberty of conscience, abolition of class privileges, responsibility of the governing body to the governed, and so forth. The Syllabus, however inopportune and inexpedient as a defiance, laid down no new principle of action, added not one clause to previous anathemas ; it did but collect, register, and publish what had been habitually accepted as axioms at the Vatican. Hence there has long been a belief in the minds of Liberal politicians in Roman Catholic countries that Christian faith (which they naturally identify with Roman Catholicism) and rational liberty are incompatible, and that unless the social progress made during the last hundred years is to be reversed, and all future advance forbidden, there is nothing for it but to break with religion. There has been, no doubt, a small minority of believing Liberals, who hoped and thought that not only might liberty be tolerated by the Papacy, but even blessed and promoted by it ; that new reforms, ecclesiastical and civil, might radiate from that centre. Such were Bordas-Dumoulin and Montalembert in France, Massimo d'Azeglio, Cesare Balbo, and Gino Capponi in Italy, Von Hirscher and Sailer in Germany ; but they were one and all

doomed to disappointment, and were viewed as worse than infidels by the Vatican ; while the episode of Liberalism with which Pius IX. began his reign did but accentuate the absolutism of his last thirty years. His death and the accession of the present Pope, as already remarked, have diminished the strain, and have revived in some quarters the same hopes as those which were entertained by the eminent group of Catholic thinkers whose names have just been given.

But there are two weighty reasons making their fulfilment unlikely. First is the constitution of the Curia itself. When Leo XIII. ascended the Papal chair, one of his earliest acts was to endeavour the reconciliation of Dr. von Döllinger, the greatest theologian and scholar in the whole of Latin Christendom, before whose splendid gifts and vast acquirements even the genius of Cardinal Newman pales. 'Come back,' said Leo XIII. ; 'there is a new Pope.' 'No,' replied Von Döllinger ; 'it is the old Papacy.' This answer compressed into epigram a fact with which our own political system makes us familiar, the enormously larger powers wielded in the long run by the permanent staff of any public department than by its temporary official head, though higher in social rank and nominal authority than all his subordinates. No English minister, however active and zealous, has been able within living memory to import efficiency into the Admiralty, the War Office, or the Colonial Office, to cite only these departments of State. The *vis inertiae* of the staff, and its superior knowledge of technical details, enable it in all these bureaux to baffle the most energetic Secretary of State, or the strictest ordeal of Parliamentary inquiry. And those who have read the sketch of 'Le Ministre malgré lui' in the late Mr. Grenville Murray's brilliant *French Pictures in English Chalk* know that the same holds good in France.

But the conservatism of the most stagnant department in any civil government of our time is nothing when compared with the resisting power of the Roman Curia. It is the oldest political institution in the world outside China and Japan, dating as it does, both as a diplomatic body in its foreign relations and an administrative one in its home character, as far back as the beginning of the fifth century, ever since which time the Roman Chancery has been fully organized. From that date onwards its traditions have run in the same channel ; its fixed aim all along has been to extend and consolidate the Papal monarchy, with the clearly envisaged view of getting its own profit in coin, patronage, and substantial power out of every transaction in which it has been concerned.



The average duration of a Papal reign from the time of Anastasius I. (A.D. 398-401), under whom the Curia first appears in full working order, has been seven years and nine months, down to the present year 1885, and that one fact shows how fleeting must be the influence that any one Pope can exert upon the policy of so ancient and permanent a body, even in the extremely rare cases where he has exhibited a desire to run counter to its principles of action, and has not himself been thoroughly imbued with them; in which event, as Baronius significantly remarks (*Ann.* 497, xxviii.), he was apt to die a sudden death. Nominally as entirely absolute master as the Sultan of Turkey is of his subjects, he is in point of fact more hampered by precedents and checked by restrictions, personal and official, than any constitutional monarch in the civil sphere. And thus he has much less in his power than the vast claims made on his behalf, and the semi-divine attributes with which he is credited, might seem to argue. No such revolution as that whereby the Mikado of Japan emancipated himself in 1868 from the usurped domination of the Shoguns, which had lasted for seven hundred years, is to be looked for from any Pope in our day.

Nor is the second reason for despondency on this head less cogent. It is that the high-water mark of Leo XIII.'s own liberalism has been reached, and the ebb has begun. Whether he has yielded to the incessant pressure exercised upon him, or has waited to make his position firm before publicly defining his policy, certain it is that his latest utterances differ from those of his predecessor rather by their more dignified tone than by any dissimilarity of purport. He has asserted anew the necessity of the temporal dominion for the well-being of the Papacy; he has denounced, almost as Pius IX. was wont to do, the religious and social movements which are out of harmony with Vaticanist ideas; he has failed to protect F. Curci from the persecution which ensued on the publication of those works which are thought to embody many of his own convictions; he has publicly recommended religious observances of the childish type in which Pius IX. delighted: in a word, though a noble example of the best kind of Italian prelate possible under existing conditions, he does not rise into a yet higher plane, and the omen which some may draw from the explanation of the motto assigned to him in the prophecy ascribed to the Abbot Joachim, 'Lumen de cœlo,' as merely referring to the comet in the Pecci arms, and as not denoting any special light to be thrown by him on the dark problems of our time, is far from encouraging.

What, then, is the precise condition of affairs with which he is confronted in the countries which acknowledge his spiritual authority? Two devout Roman Catholic priests, who declare their full belief in all the dogmas of their Church, including even that of Papal Infallibility, have given their views on the subject, and we shall proceed to summarize them. They are the French Abbé Roca and the Italian F. Curci, writing contemporaneously and independently on the very same thesis, that the Vatican is at this moment entirely out of harmony with modern society, and that unless some mode of reconciliation be speedily found and acted on, the consequences to Roman Catholic religion must be disastrous. There is great unlikeness in their style and attitude, for the Frenchman, like most of his nation, is the slave of phrases, and talks wild rhetoric in several places about the Divine source and character of democracy, believing, as he does, that a mere change in certain political and social arrangements would transform the face of the earth, and practically banish sin and suffering. But, when the froth and verbiage are cleared away, the underlying residuum is curiously like what the grave and calm ex-Jesuit has put in much more temperate language, and amounts to the startling assertion that the civil society against which the Vatican has declared war is more moral, more religious, more interpenetrated with Christian ideas and governed by Christian maxims, than the Vaticanist Church itself. Admitting to the full that those who are so influenced by Christianity are often unaware of it, and do not recognize the true source of the principles which they have really derived from the teaching of Christ Himself, both writers dwell in their several fashions upon the fact, and urge the suicidal folly of merely banning such potential disciples, instead of winning them over by gentler measures, and yet more by the immediate adoption of imperatively needed reforms, moral, educational, and administrative, in the hierarchy. The Abbé Roca, who has travelled much in the United States, and has been deeply impressed with the favourable contrast they present to France in many important particulars, divides his book into two parts, the first of which was addressed as a sort of petition to the Pope in September 1883, beseeching him to find some solution of the existing dead-lock; while the second portion, appealing to the Roman Catholic world at large, was completed at New Orleans in February 1884. The language of the earlier part distinctly implies that it was actually brought under the eyes of the Pope himself, and thus it derives some importance from enabling us to see what it has been possible for a Roman

pries  
by s  
been  
four  
Am  
two  
not  
one-  
hon  
who  
the  
reck  
relig  
dist  
leav  
that  
ing  
'If  
wou  
thou  
of I  
teen  
has  
Chr  
der  
and  
nov  
and  
is v  
Ger  
'Th  
gen  
unc  
doe  
Va  
ible  
XI  
Gr  
the  
tim  
aug  
cor  
Ca  
gui  
by

which he  
spiritual  
declare  
including  
s on the  
they are  
ing con-  
e thesis,  
harmony  
concilia-  
ences to  
is great  
man, like  
ks wild  
ce and  
a mere  
s would  
sin and  
d away,  
ave and  
anguage,  
society  
e moral,  
eas and  
Church  
fluenced  
ecognize  
derived  
d in their  
folly of  
winning  
mediate  
cational,  
oca, who  
n deeply  
o France  
vo parts,  
n to the  
solution  
ppealing  
d at New  
elior part  
the eyes  
nce from  
Roman

priest to say without incurring any official censure. He begins by stating that the facts on which he bases his appeal have been laboriously collected during an inquiry extending over fourteen years amongst the Roman Catholics of Europe and America. He says that though the Latin Church claims two hundred millions of adherents, that number, even were it not grossly exaggerated, is most unsatisfactory, being but one-seventh of the population of the earth; while, in mere honesty, the younger generations in all the Latin countries, who are rushing out of the Church, and are at open war with the Vatican, even in Rome itself, should be left out of the reckoning. Everywhere he has seen the same marks of religious decay and degeneration, and, quoting the words of a distinguished orator, 'Through our fault half the Church is leaving the Church at this moment,' he adds that the truth is that not one-half but nine-tenths of all Catholics are hastening away from Rome, never to return till reform has come. 'If Ultramontanism were the only true form of religion, one would have to say that the whole world—that is, the world of thought and movement—is plunging into apostasy.' The schism of East and West began the evil work, the schism of the sixteenth century intensified it, the Five Wounds which Rosmini has described continue to drain the vital forces of Latin Christendom, and the only remedies forthcoming are thunders and the Syllabus, charges and allocutions, Peter's pence and pilgrimages, Sacred Hearts and Madonnas, jubilees and novenas, all utterly useless. It is no mere question of race and climate, as is sometimes alleged, for the same decadence is visible amongst Irish Celts, Polish Slavs, Bulgarians and Germans in Austria-Hungary, and Spaniards in South America. 'The Latin temple is levelled to the ground. The rising generations camp in the open, away from Ultramontanism, under the melancholy star of free thought.' Believing, as he does, that the Pope has been providentially armed by the Vatican decrees with supreme powers, which make him irresistible if he chooses to employ them, the Abbé calls on Leo XIII. to abandon the policy of his predecessors Pius IX. and Gregory XVI., to reject the temporal power as the bane of the Papacy, to ally himself with the young democracy of the time, and to head the new departure of Christianity which is augured by countless tokens. Failing that, he expresses his conviction that in another fifty years there will be no Roman Catholics left except intellectual cretins or persons blinded by guilty self-interest. Such sentiments, he declares, are held by very many who are terrorized into silence—nay, in the

Congregation of the Index itself there are several prelates who think as he does.

He asserts that one of the earliest reforms needed is to sweep away, or at least seriously to modify, the overloaded and sensuous ceremonial of the Church, and to return to the simpler and more intellectual service of primitive Christian times. And he adds that the marked difference between the ordinary dress of the Latin clergy and that of other citizens puts a barrier between them which is exceedingly mischievous, making French priests look like ghosts returning from a dead past, and exposing them to popular ridicule. He mentions besides two facts which, though not relevant to this particular discussion, are yet instructive as exhibiting the temper of the obscurantist party. One is that novenas were held and special communions made by French Ultramontanes to obtain from Heaven 'the conversion of a Pope infected with Liberalism'—namely, Leo XIII.—the other that a prelate of the Curia said to the Abbé Roca himself in the course of a discussion, 'You know nothing except how to strum that old guitar of the Gospel' ('Vous ne savez que racler cette vieille guitare de l'Evangile'). He adds in another place, as showing how this irreligious spirit has infected the clergy, that within his personal knowledge there are priests who, though continuing their functions and celebrating Mass regularly, are atheists. He anxiously presses on the Pope the universal discredit and suspicion into which the clergy have fallen; how the educated classes have entirely rejected them, and the lower ranks are going fast; how it has been said that 'in every commune of France there is a light (the school-master) and an extinguisher (the curé)'; how rootedly distrust has taken possession of men's minds, so that even F. Curci and Père Hyacinthe are suspected of being secret agents of the Vatican, playing a Liberal part to deceive the public. In a long footnote the Abbé explicitly charges the miracles of La Salette and Lourdes with being deliberate impostures. He says that he made himself ridiculous, in company with five hundred others, by too hastily accepting and loudly proclaiming a miracle at La Salette, which took place under his own eyes, and almost his very fingers, but which after a formal inquiry was detected as a swindle. He describes the hierophants of these pilgrimages as 'Robert Houdins,' and speaks of the cures as 'the mystifications of sacrilegious legerdemain.'

The second main reform on which he touches is that of discipline as affecting clerical morals. He had already said in an earlier passage of his book, 'I say nothing of our celibacy,

which has become universally ridiculous' ('Je ne dis rien de notre célibat, devenu la risée du monde'); and in returning to a fuller consideration of the question he makes the following statements.

Alleging that the French clergy of the present day are the most respectable body of the kind which has existed since the temporal power began, he says that there are nevertheless many sores even among them; and no wonder, seeing that they are excluded, by vow or by constraint, from the sacred shrine of the family, which is the elementary school of propriety, the A B C of rudimentary morality. Isolated in their manses as if in lazar-houses, they are driven back day and night upon themselves, and become the prey of concentrated egoism. Barred from all the purifying influences of home, taught to regard the sacrament of matrimony as a defilement, they miss all opportunity of apprenticeship in the difficult art of directing souls. Knowing nothing of the duties of father or husband, they cannot usefully act as spiritual guides to girls and wives. Excluded, too, from a share in civil society by their vows, that society in turn rejects them, and treats them as pariahs; so that priestly marriage is the only remedy for all these evils, and that without prejudice to the true voluntary celibates, who are the flower of the clergy. He adds the significant remark that nine-tenths of the clerics in penal servitude at Brest and Toulon have found their way thither in consequence of the working of the law of celibacy. Such are the more salient points of his address to the Pope, though much of a startling kind has been necessarily omitted.

The second part of the volume goes to some extent over the same ground, and is even more rhetorical, but has some noteworthy matter, which we proceed to extract. The abolition of the Jesuits and of the mendicant orders is the first definite project of reform mentioned here; and he objects to the pauperizing action of even the philanthropic communities, saying that they would be better employed in preventive action, and notably in improving the sanitary condition of the poor. And upon this he makes the striking remark that, from his personal observation, all over the world, when you come to a town with a population partly Roman Catholic and partly Protestant, you can always tell the former districts at once by their dirt, though dirt is contrary to the spirit of both Old and New Testament, while the favourite Ultramontane saint, Benedict Labre, would have cut a very unsatisfactory figure had he been one of the subjects of the feet-washing at the Last Supper. In less clear language, perhaps purposely ob-

scure (though he is more explicit somewhat later), he speaks of the evils wrought by withholding the Scriptures from the laity; but his words may refer even more to the absence of a Gospel spirit in the sermons and other instructions offered by the clergy. In fact, he charges the whole Latin Church with having chanted the 'glad tidings' of the Gospel to men on the notes of the *De profundis* and the *Dies iræ*, by the glare of funeral torches and the flames of autos-da-fé; turning the Christian life into death, and Paradise into a place of sorrow and wailings unspeakable. He makes an energetic protest against the current theory of saintliness in the Latin Church, which he truly says is more allied to the Nirvana of Buddhism than to the active virtues of the Gospel, and he complains that it produces an emasculate paganism, sanctified with holy water and the scapular, rears devotees more like automata than living men, and that is all. Then he draws a remarkable contrast between the Bible nations, as he calls them, and the nations of the Vatican. In the last century the Anglo-Saxons were a nation of twelve millions. They have now 230,000,000 of subjects, and own one-third of the earth. The United States, no more important not so long ago than Greece now is, count their fifty millions already, and expect to have three times that number in a century. Prussia, the Michigan of Europe, has become the first military Power in the world, and that at the cost of Ultramontanism. On the other hand, the mighty empire of Spain has sunk to the lowest place, and, as an indignant Spaniard cried, 'the Inquisition, the monks, and the priests have made it the Turkey of the West.' France has lost her splendid American and Indian possessions, and for her fair Rhine provinces has got in exchange the barren rocks of Savoy and the sandy plains of Algiers. Austria has become the vassal of Prussia; and everywhere the races which have accepted Ultramontanism are the servants of those which have rejected it. Even more striking is their ratio of increase in population. Nine non-Roman nations, with Russia at the head of the list and Denmark at the end, increase at rates ranging from 1'39 to 1'05 per annum, and double their population in periods ranging from fifty to sixty-six years. Five in union with Rome, with Belgium at the head and France at the foot, grow at yearly rates varying from 0'88 to 0'28, and double in terms of from seventy-nine to one hundred and ninety years, so that the future of the world is plainly with the non-Roman nations; without taking into account a further calculation, not mentioned by the Abbé Roca, but drawn from the *Almanach de Gotha* for 1874, from which it appears

that  
wor  
204,9  
lower  
main  
reme  
that  
wors  
doctr  
of al  
to b  
divid  
F  
putti  
the  
whic  
affect  
exce  
furni  
Wha  
betw  
ence  
Cath  
liefs  
and  
Abb  
whic  
and  
atten  
send  
Cour  
refor  
the C  
blanc  
orga  
espe  
upon  
self  
bond  
truth  
proof  
(mak  
mitte  
in 15  
good



that the alleged increase of Roman Catholics all over the world from 1840 to that date was from 189,000,000 to 204,000,000, which is less by a good deal than even the lowest of the ratios just given, that of France. Such are the main facts which the Abbé has marshalled, and his ideal remedy is the abandonment of the Vatican policy, with all that remains of the temporal power, the simplification of the worship and ordinances of the Roman Church, without any doctrinal changes, and the consequent return within her fold of all the scattered Christian communities, which he considers to be still parts of the one true Church, though externally divided.

F. Curci, though much more temperate in his way of putting things, is in remarkable accord with the Abbé on all the main points involved. His survey is restricted to Italy, which, as the headquarters of Roman Catholicism, and less affected by the Reformation than any other Western countries except Spain and Portugal, ought, on Roman principles, to furnish the most satisfactory moral and religious results. What F. Curci has actually to tell us is the wide divorce between the Italian nation and the Church, the fatal indifference to religion which prevails, even amongst 'practising Catholics,' the degraded and Pagan type of such popular beliefs and cults as do hold their ground, the crass ignorance and low moral tone of the mass of the clergy. Like the Abbé Roca, F. Curci considers that modern civilization with which the Vatican is at war to be fundamentally Christian, and the Vatican to be the enemy of Christianity itself in its attempt to suppress it, as it resisted earlier improvements too, sending Savonarola to the stake, baffling the efforts of the Councils of Constance and Florence, and postponing those reforms which were delayed till the Council of Trent, when the German schism was already accomplished. A false semblance of unity is maintained, he tells us, by means of an organized terrorism brought to bear upon every Catholic, and especially every ecclesiastic, who ventures to speak his mind upon all these evils, but who in doing so virtually dooms himself to temporal ruin. Even the Pope himself is held in bondage, and cannot act as a free agent, so that on all hands truth as well as liberty suffers violence. And, after supplying proof of the disasters wrought by the law of clerical celibacy (making the state of morals as bad as they were when the Committee of Cardinals presented their terrible Report to Paul III. in 1538), F. Curci suggests that, for the honour of God and the good of souls, it would be well for the Church to make priestly

marriage permissible. It would be better, he says, to preserve the jewel of purity set as it were in silver than, while boasting that it is mounted in gold, let it drop into the mire. And only in the frank abandonment of the policy of Pius IX., in the abolition of the Curia, and in such educational and disciplinary reforms as will raise the standard of clerical reading and morals, and bring back Christianity into popular teaching and devotion, whence the paganized cults in fashion have driven it, does he see any hope for the future; though he, like the Abbé Roca, desires to have these results produced without any doctrinal changes preceding or accompanying them.

Nor are things any better in France. The last census, in 1881, showed, alongside the tiny fraction of Protestants, amounting to no more than 1·8 of the nation, 7,684,906 persons who declared themselves to have no religious belief. The Abbé Bougaud<sup>1</sup> complains that there is a formidable diminution in the number of candidates for holy orders, so that many hundreds of parishes, not to speak of curacies, remain vacant (2,568 in 1877) and cannot be filled, while the nobility, the gentry, the professional class, and, in short, all above the grade of peasants, small shopkeepers, and artizans have ceased to contribute pupils to the seminaries; so that the material now to be had is inferior in quality as well as in numbers, and many evils, social and religious, are springing up in consequence. The Abbé Bougaud lays the blame of this abstention on various causes, such as the habit of the nobility of bringing up their children in idleness, so that the hard work of the ministry is distasteful to them, the unbelief and indifference of the highly educated class, and the repugnance of the *bourgeoisie* for the poverty which is the normal lot of the French priest. He points out, moreover, that the evil is not all due to this poverty, which makes the lot of the French clergy a hard one, but is partly attributable to the decree of the Council of Trent upon clerical seminaries, which lays down that 'the children of poor persons are preferably to be chosen [as students], though the sons of rich people are not to be excluded, provided they pay for their own maintenance' (Sess. XXIII. cap. xviii.). The really good motive which most probably suggested this decree has not averted the mischiefs it has led to. But the joint authors of the pamphlet *Pourquoi le Clergé Français est Ultramontain* allege that he has omitted the most important reason of all, that of the defence-

<sup>1</sup> See a review of M. Bougaud's book in a paper on *The Supply of Clergy* by the late lamented Sir Robert Phillimore in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1880.

less condition of the lower clergy, in face of the exorbitant power of the Bishops, at whose mercy they are, and who too often exhibit caprice and tyranny in their administration, while discouraging the study of canon law, lest the clergy should learn what are their vested rights, and the pursuit of secular learning, lest it should make them too independent in mind. Nothing is easier than to ruin a French priest, and as a fact the number who are driven out of the ministry yearly, or drop out of its ranks without any fair trial, and often for no adequate cause, is considerable. And if the French clergy are Ultramontane, the writers say that the reason is that the only place to which they can look with any hope of getting justice done them, when oppressed by their ecclesiastical superiors, is Rome, for their own civil government gives them no protection, and the old safeguards of the earlier law have been swept away by the Concordat of 1801, and by the gradual abolition of the diocesan and metropolitan courts, whose procedure was some check on episcopal caprice. An intelligent French Catholic, who travels much through France on commercial business, quite recently volunteered to the present writer the statement, that the irreligion noticeable everywhere in France is mainly owing to the fact that the clergy, being 'mal composé,' and all but universally 'de bas étage,' sons of domestic servants very often, have not the manners, the knowledge, or the personal weight which would enable them to exercise a wholesome influence; and that it is just where the few of a higher stamp can be found that things are a little better.

In Belgium, where the Church of Rome has even a greater monopoly than in France or Italy, no more than 15,000 Protestants being found among the five millions and a half inhabitants, the tension of the situation between the Clericals and the Liberals is acute, and has recently brought the country within measurable distance of revolution. And though the two parties are almost evenly balanced, yet the growth is steadily, if slowly, on the Liberal side, which means at best indifference to religion, and may easily mean, as in France, hostility. The religious condition of Spain and Portugal is confessedly deplorable, though in the former country there are not forty thousand open dissidents, all told, from the Roman Church in a population of more than sixteen and a-half millions; while in Portugal the ratio is considerably smaller, there being but five hundred non-Romans (chiefly foreigners) out of the entire population of 4,306,554 in 1881.

As for the state of things in Germany, inclusive of Aus-  
VOL. XX.—NO. XXXIX.

M

tria (without taking account of the Old Catholic movement, which lies outside of the present inquiry), a paper by Professor von Schulte in the *Contemporary Review* for August 1879 contains some instructive facts. For example, he shows by tables that the proportion of Catholics who attend the higher grade schools in Prussia (passage through which is a prerequisite to holding any public post, and to practising as a lawyer or medical man) is much smaller, not only than that of the Protestants, but of the Jews, who are therefore thrusting Catholics out of these influential positions. And he says that this is due to the bishops, who dislike a well-educated clergy, as being too independent, while the clergy apply the same rule to the laity, and dissuade parents whom they can influence from sending children to the superior schools. For girls Catholics have only convent schools, which are inferior to the Protestant ones, so that it has become frequent to send Catholic girls to the Protestant schools, with the alternative of becoming indifferent to religion if they go thither or becoming bigots if the convent is preferred. In the Universities, similarly, Catholics form but a small percentage of the students, and are dropping behind, consequently, in all higher culture. The competition of a Protestant majority, and the stimulus given to religious enthusiasm by Prince Bismarck's unwise policy of persecution, have done something to help Roman Catholicism in Prussian territory; but in Austria, where there is a virtual Catholic monopoly (but 407,000 Protestants being found to 17,693,000 Catholics at the last census), things are very bad indeed. No communions at all are made, as a rule, by any of the upper classes, unless official interests require it; 75 per cent. of the men and 50 per cent. of the women in those same classes never go to confession, communion, or church; confession certificates are habitually bought from women who make a trade of going to the priests, procuring a ticket, and selling it to any customer who does not choose to attend the ordinance personally. There is no domestic religion, no home training of children in the practice of devotion, and an occasional 'snap Mass,' an abbreviated office loungingly attended, with the regulation yearly confession and communion, exhausts the record.

In Russia, the once powerful Uniat Church has declined from several millions to a mere handful of adherents; while in the East the policy of Pius IX., by his Brief *Reversurus* in 1867, broke up the Armenian Unia, and even drove the long loyal Maronites into revolt. And though some reconstruction has taken place with the former, and the latter have been

pac  
has  
firm  
thing  
Rom  
large  
of th  
discu  
from  
Cath  
least  
per c  
of Sp  
to no  
6,143  
is son  
aroun  
fail to  
itself  
Cath  
articl  
Italy.  
tion o  
Amer  
in cor  
the S  
A  
for th  
Nation  
rebuk  
princip  
deman  
in pol  
going  
Dublin  
organ  
in the  
of agr  
him; a  
of tho  
counte  
was, '  
him,'  
having

pacified for the time, yet the tradition of submissive deference has been rudely interrupted, and can never be put upon its old firm basis again.

As to America, the simplest proof of the condition of things there is the extreme reluctance shown by the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood to allow of emigration thither, so large are the defections from Roman Catholicism on the part of the new citizens. Some few years back the *Dublin Review* discussed this question, and said that, so heavy were the losses from this cause, it was only too probable that the Roman Catholics in America, who ought to amount in 1880 to at least fifteen millions, seeing that the Celtic element is thirty per cent. of the population, and the newly-acquired territories of Spanish planting were to be added in, would in fact amount to no more than nine or ten millions. The actual figures were 6,143,122, thus attesting enormous losses. And though there is some trifling set-off in the conversions from the various sects around which occasionally take place, yet not only do they fail to redress the balance, but the atmosphere of America is itself seriously modifying the character of the local Roman Catholicism, which would hardly be accepted as the genuine article in the Ultramontane circles of France, Belgium, or Italy. One particular will suffice:—the strong recommendation of lay Bible-reading which has issued from a synod of American Roman Catholic bishops within the last few weeks, in contradistinction to the neglect, if not the prohibition, of the Scriptures in the old homes of Ultramontaniam.

As to Ireland, the outlook there is not much more pleasant for the Papacy than it is for the English Government. The Nationalist bishops and clergy openly or secretly disregard the rebukes of the Pope, and admit by act, if not by word, the principle laid down for them by their flocks, that if they demand to lead in religion they must be content to follow in politics. Quite recently the late Cardinal McCabe, on going to hold a service in a rural church not very far from Dublin, found that he had no congregation, no choir, and no organist. His exalted rank and local authority were nothing in the eyes of the people in comparison with his disapproval of agrarian agitation, so that a slight was deliberately put on him; and when a landlord of the neighbourhood spoke to one of those concerned, and reminded him how he was going counter to the Pope, whom he professed to revere, the reply was, 'Let the Pope mind his own business, or we'll boycott him.' The simple fact is that the Roman Catholic clergy, having for generations past taught the peasantry not to



examine their own consciences, and judge for themselves as to right and wrong, but to accept the authority of an extern person instead, find that, while their lesson has been faithfully committed to memory and heart, another authority has been substituted for their own as that to which the peasant will give his allegiance, and that an authority which makes logically for unbelief; as their own has long made for virtual barbarism and against civilization. This is in fact only the local manifestation of a phenomenon visible in all lands where Roman teaching has prevailed, as noticed by two such keen observers as the Marchese Nobili-Vitelleschi and the late Professor Amiel of Geneva, who both remark that revolutionary excesses are entirely restricted to Roman Catholic countries, in recoil from the despotism which has left no free action to the individual conscience. Another very weighty fact which presents itself in this connexion, unnoticed by the Abbé Roca, and not coming within the sphere of F. Curci's survey, is the disproportionate excess of Roman Catholic criminals in every country where there is a mixed population. This is true for Great Britain and Ireland, for the United States and Canada, for Australia, for Prussia, and for the Netherlands; thus attesting the operation of a general law, and the defectiveness of the Roman Church as a teacher of conduct. Obviously, wherever public attention is drawn to this contrast between Roman Catholics and non-Romans, a strong barrier against proselytism is at once set up, since it will very fairly be concluded that little spiritual advantage can be gained from submitting to teachers who have failed so signally.

It is now time to consider the condition of the Roman mission in England, which seemed such a promising field forty years ago, and where a lavish increase of clerical plant, both in staff and buildings, continues to be made year by year, till the *Catholic Directory* for 1885 gives the numbers for England and Wales as 17 archbishops and bishops, 2,198 priests, and 1,259 churches, chapels, and stations; while it is the policy of the present authorities to multiply the latter as much as possible, even in neighbourhoods where there is no present demand for them, on the same principle as railways are made in the United States through uninhabited regions, in the hope that they may draw settlers. It has been too hastily concluded by timorous persons that this vast development of material resources denotes achieved successes, and not mere advertising for custom; and the lack of any such religious census for England as exists for Ireland has been of further help to the Roman missionaries, when loudly proclaiming their rapid ad-

vance  
of rec  
statist  
N  
And  
name  
name  
wheth  
grade  
the lis  
goes  
names  
of An  
presen  
the lis  
that is  
or rep  
the tw  
fewer  
and su  
Catho  
any se  
Roma  
the hig  
a refl  
but by

Ne  
of the  
the di  
Roman  
requiri  
Cathol  
tion, le  
Consec  
marria  
a start  
subseq  
of Rom  
1845, l  
Roman  
Roman  
per cen  
per cen  
It has  
1874, a



vance and the shoals of converts whom they are in the habit of receiving, since direct confutation by means of authoritative statistics seemed impracticable.

Nevertheless the materials for refutation are at hand. And first may be put the list of 'Converts to Rome,' which is named at the head of this article. It professes to give the names of practically all persons of any mark, however humble, whether due to personal claims or to their belonging to any grade in society above the lower middle class. And though the list includes American, French, and German converts, and goes back to the beginning of the century, only about 3,000 names are recorded (some erroneously), of which 337 are those of Anglican clergymen, being about six months' supply at the present rate of English ordinations. Another peculiarity of the list is the intellectual obscurity of all the later converts—that is to say, from 1858 onwards—there being no continuance or repetition of the exodus of distinguished men which marked the two periods of 1845 and 1850; themselves, however, far fewer and less eminent collectively than is currently supposed, and surpassed both in numbers and in distinction by the Old Catholic seceders from Rome in 1870. No one pretends that any serious impression is being made on England at large by the Roman body, and thus the list we have been citing is virtually the high-water mark of its success; while, it may be added, a reflux has begun, not only by the rarity of fresh conversions, but by the return of many converts to the Church of England.

Next, there is a sufficiently trustworthy test applicable, that of the marriage returns made by the Registrar-General; for the discipline as to marriage is exceedingly strict amongst Roman Catholics, quite as much as it is with Jews and Quakers, requiring that the ceremony should be performed by a Roman Catholic priest, and not by a minister of any other denomination, least of all by a mere civil union in a registrar's office. Consequently, once we know the ratio of Roman Catholic marriages to those of the whole population at a given date as a starting point, we have merely to verify the numbers at subsequent periods in order to learn whether the proportion of Roman Catholics is increasing or diminishing. Now in 1845, before the Irish famine which led to the great influx of Roman Catholics from Ireland into England, the ratio of Roman Catholic marriages in England and Wales was 1·95 per cent. In 1850 the cause just mentioned sent it up to 3·68 per cent.; and in 1853 it reached its maximum, 5·09 per cent. It has never kept up to that record, but was as low as 4·04 in 1874, and was no more than 4·5 in 1882, the last return issued.

Nay, in London that year, though with a very large Roman Catholic population and the head-quarters of the proselytizing campaign, the Roman Catholic ratio was only 3·9, as compared with 83·4 Church of England marriages. The *Statesman's Year Book* and *Whitaker's Almanac* for 1885 both set down the Roman Catholics of Great Britain (including Scotland) at about two millions. But this is apparently mere guesswork, and in large excess of the real number. For deducting 300,000 for Scotland (which is, if anything, too low) that would leave 1,700,000 out of 26,000,000 for England and Wales, in which case they ought to have a ratio of 6·5 per cent. in the marriage returns as their just proportion. But the actual ratio of 4·5 per cent. makes them only 1,170,000. As they were 982,000 in 1866, according to a careful calculation in Ravenstein's *Denominational Statistics* (London, 1870), this represents an annual increase of only just over one per cent. But the average increase of the whole population during the same time has been more than 1·35 per cent. yearly, and the only possible deduction from these facts is that the Roman Catholic losses, whether due to emigration or to secessions, are so enormous that they cannot keep pace with the rest of the nation, despite their three sources of increase, births, immigration from Ireland and the Continent, and conversions, and despite the large ratio which the first of these factors should account for, in view of the early marriages and prolific increase of the Irish element. The inevitable conclusion is that the leakage from Roman Catholicism in England (which, as not advertised and trumpeted, is silent and hidden) far exceeds the missionary successes of its proselytizers. And it may be added in this connexion that the Abbé Roca's comparative tables are notably reinforced by the fact that whereas thirty years ago Roman Catholics constituted one-third of the population of the United Kingdom, they now constitute only one-seventh. Of course the exodus from Ireland is mainly accountable for this declension in ratio, as it is for the increase, such as it is, of Roman Catholicism in the United States, seeing that the emigration from Ireland, almost exclusively thither and Roman Catholic, is known from statistical tables to have amounted to 2,905,479 persons between 1851 and 1883; while, as the population of Ireland declined between 1841 and 1851 by more than a million and a half, mostly through emigration also, it is safe to assume that one-third of this further number was absorbed by England and the remainder by America. These figures consequently account for nearly the whole of the Roman Catholic population

in the  
Irish  
Mons  
he m  
Amer  
Roma  
tually  
and s  
there  
Some  
he wa  
signor  
progr

'I  
energy  
learned  
large c  
with so  
foggy  
hardly  
A con

It  
moder  
Roma  
of Yo  
existe  
but liv  
priest  
of a va  
his pe  
youth  
with a  
of disc  
his pro  
him :  
telling  
them  
the Ch  
comic  
preach

Th  
Philip  
astrou  
keep t  
Mivar

in the two countries mainly affected by the emigration, for the Irish, as just observed, marry early and are a prolific race. Monsignor Capel was therefore quite justified by statistics when he made the incautious admission, in a lecture he delivered in America in 1884, that it is the Irish immigrants who keep the Roman faith alive in England, and without them it would virtually disappear. Now, as he has been one of the most active and successful of proselytizers for his Church in this country, there could scarcely be a more conclusive confession of failure. Some remarks of Lord Braye's, for the imprudence of which he was sharply rebuked by the *Tablet*, serve to reinforce Monsignor Capel's statement. He says, lamenting over the slow progress of Romanism here—

'Is there any religious body in the country where so much fine energy is wasted? Learned priests without anyone to buy their learned books; aged professors with two pupils apiece; a dozen large colleges when one public school would be sufficient; dioceses with scarce a parish priest to a county. What is the use, under these foggy circumstances, of building great churches in a place where you hardly get a server for Mass? . . . . We are a small body and poor. A convert from the middle class is unknown.'

It is worth while digressing for a moment, to tell how the modern Anglo-Roman régime is relished by old-fashioned Roman Catholics of Gallican traditions. There is a district of Yorkshire where a small Roman Catholic population has existed for three centuries, unaffected by the Reformation, but living on quite friendly terms with their neighbours. The priest who ministered to one group of these, a kindly old man of a vanishing type, not specially rigid or austere, but loved by his people, died not long ago, and his place was filled by a youthful successor, a hot Italianizing zealot, who began to sweep with all the energy of a new broom, and to pull tighter the cords of discipline which he thought had been too loosely held by his predecessor. The result was that he set the people against him: so they despatched a round robin to the Roman bishop, telling him that if he did not remove that 'Puseyite,' and send them some one more like their old priest, they would all 'join the Church.' This was the precise phrase used, and is highly comic, in view of what their new pastor must have been preaching to them on that head.

That the attempts of Rome to recover England, from Philip and Mary down to the present day, have ended in disastrous failure is evident to all who have read history and keep their eyes open, and is admitted by Mr. St. George Mivart to be God's own doing. The notion that it is other-

wise is due partly to credulous acceptance of contrary statements made by interested persons, and to the astute manner in which the Anglo-Roman body is kept constantly before the public by means of continual demonstrations of various kinds, fully detailed in the press both of London and of the provinces; and partly to a less obvious cause—the greater similarity which Roman Catholic congregations present to Anglican ones in their constituent elements than Protestant Dissenting ones do. For the latter are in most cases homogeneous, and drawn exclusively from the lower middle class; so that, be they Methodist, Anabaptist, or Congregationalist, they have a type of their own, at once distinguishable from that of a Church congregation. But Roman Catholics have an aristocratic element, consisting of old hereditary Roman families of rank and fortune, and of those highly-placed converts who have been so sedulously courted; a large proletarian element, mainly Irish; while the tenants and other dependents of the wealthy members of the body supply the middle-class element, and produce, in union with the two other factors, a general likeness of Roman to Anglican religious assemblies, which may very easily lead hasty observers to think them to be made up of converts, and so proofs of a widely successful system of proselytism.

As the educated convert clergy are rapidly dying out, and their place is being supplied chiefly by ecclesiastics of the same social grade and the same kind of training as the mixed multitude of Irish, French, and Belgian priests, who form so large a factor in the *Catholic Directory*, the temporary varnish of culture, which has done so much to make the Roman system acceptable to Englishmen of the upper classes, is wearing off day by day, and results similar to those produced by the peasant clergy in France and Ireland are certain to follow. And, meanwhile, the continued revivification of the Church of England, by providing for those natural and reasonable demands of countless devout minds which found no satisfaction in established Anglicanism, whether as coloured by the Calvinism dominant under Elizabeth, the Latitudinarianism of the Hanoverian era, or the High and Dry and Evangelical parties which divided the Church between them in the first quarter of the present century, had reduced the leakage towards Rome to the feeblest dribble, even before the Vatican decrees made secession an impossibility for everyone not either an intellectual or a moral cripple.

The English nation is thus not merely non-Roman, but has deliberately rejected Romanism when tendered to it for

accept  
Churc  
salvat  
Christ  
manif  
decay  
contra  
macy  
Cardi  
testim  
most  
trast  
Catho  
article  
Amer  
Mivan  
day, p  
in the  
has n  
Amer  
chief  
intenc  
hearen  
suprem  
such  
'Wha  
Christ  
warfar  
one fa  
made  
Englis  
has a  
openn  
he wor  
it is n  
to any  
countr  
univers  
where  
mutter  
Roma

<sup>1</sup> T  
and Ro  
this art  
tion of

acceptance. On any hypothesis that Rome is the one true Church, that communion with the Pope is a prerequisite for salvation, and that Roman Catholicism is the purest form of Christianity, the consequences of this rejection ought to be manifested in such widespread moral, religious, and social decay as to make England a portent of warning, in shameful contrast with the happy lands which acknowledge the supremacy of the Vatican. But the official head of Anglo-Romanism, Cardinal Manning, can at once be called as a witness, and his testimony is decisive, that the civil society of England is the most Christian and healthy in existence, and notably in contrast with that of France, Italy, Spain, and other Roman Catholic countries. This he set out at some length in an article on 'The Church and Modern Society' in the *North American Review* for February 1880; while Mr. St. George Mivart, one of the most eminent lay Roman Catholics of the day, proclaimed the same doctrine in a most remarkable paper in the *Dublin Review* for July 1884. But Cardinal Manning has not confined himself to expressing this opinion in an American magazine. On the contrary, it has formed the chief topic of several speeches he has made in public here, all intended to advertise his communion, and to persuade his hearers that the one thing alone needed to crown the moral supremacy of England is its submission to the Holy See. One such utterance is reported in the *Times* of July 17, 1884: 'What made England? He did not ask what made it a Christian land, but what made England great? It was not warfare, nor conquest, nor politics, nor legislation. It was that one faith and that one love of God and our neighbour which made a united England. The same might also be said of English freedom and liberty.' He is a clever man, and has a just confidence in the want of logic, the ignorance, and openness to flattery which characterize his hearers, or else he would be afraid to make such dangerous admissions. For it is not easy to see what answer he would have available to any critic who might get up and ask him why it is that countries which have been blessed with Vaticanism are so universally bankrupt in religion and morals; why Ireland, where murder, arson, and robbery stalk abroad with the muttered benediction of at least a powerful section of the Roman Catholic clergy,<sup>1</sup> is the one exception to that social

<sup>1</sup> The late P. J. Smyth, M.P., a devoted but independent Nationalist and Roman Catholic, in the posthumous pamphlet named at the head of this article, has pointed out the active complicity of one considerable section of the Roman clergy in the anarchical and immoral doctrines, en-

and moral order which he predicates of the United Kingdom; why some evident tokens of Divine displeasure have not shown that the English Reformation was a sin. The Abbé Roca is exactly in accord with him in that, while he extols the religious and moral condition of the United States as incomparably superior to anything he knows of in Latin Europe (without stating that the Irish Roman Catholic element is the one lamentable exception, being corrupt, turbulent, and criminal to a degree which makes it the curse of every American city where it is powerful), he yet suggests that they should imperil their prosperity by submitting to the very yoke which has proved such a curse to France, to Italy, and to Spain. It is just because England has cut herself adrift from the Pope and all his works that she has escaped the fate which has fallen on the lands of Vaticanism.

What both Roca and Curci fail to see, or at any rate to say, is that their programme of administrative reform, unattended by any doctrinal reform, is futile. There have been many partial reforms of discipline, many careful cleansings of the outside of the cup and platter, made in the Roman Church, and notably at Trent; but there never has been any withdrawal of a doctrinal issue to which Rome has once formally committed itself, whatever the practical working of the particular tenet may have been. 'Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.' 'Of course,' is the Ultramontane reply, 'for the Church, being infallible, could not have taught or even tolerated theological error, and thus there is nothing which can be taken back, for it is all Divine truth.' We are not going to argue that question here and now, but simply to point out that both Roca and Curci, in declaring war against the Vatican and the Curia, have forgotten Napoleon's aphorism, 'You can't make omelettes without breaking eggs.' If the Pope be really the Divinely chartered head of Christendom, if he be the privileged heir of S. Peter, uniting in himself the offices of sovereign ruler and infallible teacher of the Church, with direct jurisdiction in every part of the Christian world, and with indefeasible rights over even those Christians who refuse to acknowledge his authority, it is his foremost duty not to let these vast powers, entailing

forced by crime, which have been rife in Ireland of late years, and the timorous acquiescence of another section, which is afraid to protest openly; only a few exceptional instances being found where the convictions are healthy, and there is courage to act upon them in opposition to the popular current, though that current is 'an outrage on the fundamental principles of morality, and a negation of the dogmas of Christianity.'

such  
them  
not c  
howe  
part  
have  
of a  
routh  
save  
Rom  
civil  
solub  
doma  
politi  
must  
accre  
of th  
organ  
will  
have  
the C  
Petri  
recon

T  
the l  
pract  
Cath  
fruit  
acy t  
Bless  
just,  
ideal  
derne  
draw  
dead  
the in  
which  
like t  
touch  
the s  
remed  
can an  
have  
by th  
forbid



such tremendous responsibilities, lie dormant. He must use them, and not let them lie folded in a napkin. But since he is not omniscient and omnipresent, since no single human being, however gifted and energetic, could get through one-hundredth part of the labour involved, it is a necessity that he should have the assistance of a numerous and highly organized staff of a permanent character, which must not only do the whole routine work required, but practically take cognizance of all save a very few of the most important matters referred to Rome for arbitration. And as the problem of disentangling civil from religious questions has proved, and must prove, insoluble, the authority which claims to be supreme in the domain of faith and morals must necessarily interfere in all political debates where faith and morals are concerned, and must exercise its diplomatic influence through trained and accredited agents; while it follows, from the constant operation of the laws of human nature, that the executive of such an organization as is necessitated by the conditions of the case will think and act as members of similar close corporations have acted since the dawn of history. That is to say: Destroy the Curia to-morrow, and start fair, leaving the doctrine of the Petrine claims untouched, and the Curia must needs begin to be reconstituted the day after, soon to be precisely what it is now.

The fact is that principles always work themselves out in the long run, however slow the process may be; and every practical abuse, every moral delinquency, of which the Roman Catholic writers we have cited accuse the Vatican, is the natural fruit of erroneous theological dogma. The hysterical effeminacy they complain of is directly traceable to substituting the Blessed Virgin, practically regarded as a woman more soft than just, and as peculiarly open to flattery, for the Man-God, the ideal of strength, wisdom, and justice, as well as of purity, tenderness, and mercy. The childish devotions and manuals which draw down F. Curci's censure are the outcome of the use of a dead language in the chief public offices; the Vatican itself is the inevitable corollary of the Petrine legend. Every palliative which has been applied in the course of ages has been merely like those medicines which drive an eruption inwards without touching the disease of which it is only the symptom; and the spots are sure to crop out again when the temporary remedy has spent its force. Only a thorough doctrinal reform can arrest the disintegration and decay to which the writers we have cited bear testimony. And the path to that is blocked by the Vatican decrees and the Infallibility dogma, which forbid any confession of error. What shall be the end thereof?

ART. VIII.—BISHOP WORDSWORTH'S EPISCOPATE,  
1869–1885.

1. *Miscellanies, Literary and Religious.* By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. (London, 1879.)
2. *Conjectural Emendations of Passages in Ancient Authors, with other Papers.* By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. (London, 1883.)
3. *Triennial Addresses delivered at the Visitation of the Diocese of Lincoln.* Fifth series. By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. (Lincoln, 1882.)

ON December 12, 1884, within a month of the termination of the 'honoured episcopate' of Archbishop Trench, under whom he had worked so long as Canon of Westminster, Bishop Christopher Wordsworth announced his intention of resigning the Bishopric of Lincoln, an intention which with characteristic promptitude was carried into effect at the end of January of the present year. To both Prelates a tribute as eloquent as it is well deserved was given from the pulpit of the abbey in which they had worshipped for so long together and borne witness so unflinchingly to the truth:—

'They have been,' said Canon Furse, 'associates of literary men, have run the gauntlet of the acutest criticism, in days when controversy has ground the steel of subtle judgment to the sharpest edge; they have been students, poets, scholars, Biblical critics and interpreters, and after long retirement, which made their acquaintances dubious of their success, they were translated from this abbey to scenes where they were called from their books to manage men, and to express their convictions, and prove their theories in the roughest friction with practical politics.'

To Archbishop Trench's work grateful reference has already been made in our pages.<sup>1</sup> To some aspects of the contemporary episcopate of Bishop Wordsworth we desire now to refer, and the more so because we feel that it suggests lessons which have not been as yet drawn out with the fulness which their importance deserves. In the works placed at the head of this article many different subjects are discussed, with all the dignity and grace, the fresh enthusiasm and matured wisdom, associated for so long by intelligent and believing Churchmen with the name of Bishop Wordsworth. Their

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 38, pp. 475-77.

moral value is as large as their intellectual, for, to quote from an article which appeared in the *Yorkshire Post*, 'Whatever may be the subject on which he dilates, . . . we know and feel that he is at work to leave the world better than he found it, and that the power of religion is in his heart.'

In proposing the resolution in which the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury expressed its regard for the Bishop of Lincoln, the Bishop of Winchester spoke of the 'many advantages' under which Bishop Wordsworth had begun life. 'The son of a very distinguished man and the nephew of a great poet, he was educated at the great public school which was founded by one of the most eminent of my predecessors, the great Bishop of Winchester. He went from that most ancient public school to the still more distinguished College of Trinity, at Cambridge.' Modern fashions notwithstanding, we think that no one who has traced the course of Bishop Wordsworth and the distinguished men who have been his contemporaries, whether in Church or State, will deny that older methods of training have a good deal to say for themselves, and no one has felt their value more strongly than the subject of this notice.

'Great,' he wrote, 'are the advantages enjoyed by candidates for Holy Orders in these ancient seminaries of sound learning, in the ennobling memories of a glorious past, and of an illustrious, spiritual, and intellectual ancestry, and in social intercourse of liberal studies and manly sports with students in the middle and higher ranks of society destined for other professions. Manifold are the benefits of training in classical and mathematical discipline and learning, and in other pursuits which give a dignity and strength, a breadth and depth, a refinement and tact, a frankness and generosity to the character of many an English clergyman nurtured in our English Universities.'<sup>1</sup>

Testimony not less generous was borne in two sermons entitled, 'The Hope of Glory and the Future of our Universities,' in which with words remarkable alike for their strength and pathos the Bishop encouraged his hearers not to relax their efforts, however sweeping the changes then imminent might be, for 'men may abrogate our statutes, but they cannot cancel our history; it is stereotyped for ever.'

In after years the Bishop has been wont to remind his Diocese 'that there can be no such thing as sound theology without accurate philology,' and what was enforced by precept had certainly been first suggested by example. A smile must have hung about the lips of many at the Church Congress

<sup>1</sup> *Triennial Addresses*, p. 75.

held at Derby in 1882, as they heard the keen, incisive paper 'On the Controversy with Rome,' prefaced by the unexpected confession that 'about fifty years ago' Dr. Milner's *End of Controversy* had 'made an impression' upon the venerable speaker 'which he should never forget;' but few, perhaps, reflected how the classical training followed by the really adventurous travels described with so much grace and humour in the first volume of the *Miscellanies*<sup>1</sup> had trained the mind and will which now, with ripened wisdom, was strengthening their attachment to the Church of England, and enabling not a few, perhaps for the first time, 'to give some reasons for that attachment.'

To these earlier studies the Bishop has been ever faithful, and in the *Collection of Specimens of Conjectural Emendations on some Passages in Ancient Authors* he has only lately given us specimens of his power. 'That antiquarian pursuits are not altogether fruitless and vain' is shown in the beautiful peroration which closes the paper 'Where was Dodona?' delivered at the Lincoln Diocesan Architectural and Archaeological Society's meeting at Spalding in June 1882, and in the delightful address which those who heard it will not have forgotten, in which the members of the Royal Archaeological Institute at the annual meeting held at Lincoln in 1880, were welcomed 'to our own archaeological Olympia.'

But the Bishop was prepared for his episcopate by action as well as study: for in theological study he never forgot the duties of a priest and pastor. His experience had been, though it may surprise our readers to hear it, even larger than that enjoyed by Bishop Wilberforce. He had been for eight years Head-master of Harrow. For nearly a quarter of a century he had held a Canonry at Westminster, residing, by 'a remarkable coincidence,' in the house 'adjoining the chapel of S. Catherine, in which S. Hugh was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln on September 21, 1186, being S. Matthew's Day.' To the Canonry had been more recently (1865-1869) added the Archdeaconry of Westminster. As Vicar of Stanford-in-the-Vale (1850-1869) and Rural Dean in the Diocese of Oxford the future bishop had become acquainted with all the difficulties, temptations, and encouragements of a country cure. While in residence he had taught daily in the Parochial School, and twice in each week the children were catechized in church. The result was that 'three per cent. of the population were confirmed annually,' although, as its pastor 'knew from

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 1-66.

caref  
firms  
and t  
ment  
while  
which  
gentl  
quest  
muni  
least,  
tratio  
S. Ma  
secat  
ideas  
episc

It  
Churc  
dered  
Word  
the h  
all hi  
every  
Bisho  
which  
dence  
surrou  
hesita  
respec  
who,  
who  
making  
opinio  
line of  
of wh  
as in  
the li  
Word

TH  
Catho  
exerci  
princip  
gelica  
the Bi  
cious

careful inquiry, at least *five* per cent. *ought* to have been confirmed here.' At the Abbey acquaintance had been gained, and that not only theoretically, with the wants and management of the poverty-stricken districts which surround it; while in the Lower House of Convocation, and in sermons which set many a hearer thinking more devoutly and intelligently of the reason of the hope that was in him, larger questions affecting the position of the whole Anglican Communion had been thoroughly worked out. Last, but not least, the Commentary on the Bible, with its wealth of illustration from sources so varied, was almost complete when on S. Matthias's Day, 1869, Archdeacon Wordsworth was consecrated to the See of Lincoln, already accustomed to high ideas of scholarship and unselfish work during the long episcopates of Bishop Kaye and Bishop Jackson.

It is in no spirit of disparagement of great services to the Church already rendered in the diocese, and now being rendered elsewhere as there, that we venture to pronounce Bishop Wordsworth's tenure of his office an epoch-making event in the history of the Church of England. We do not say that all his plans have been as yet fully carried out, or that, in every respect, entire success was granted. But the sixty-first Bishop of Lincoln has restored an ideal of the episcopal office which, we feel sure, cannot again disappear, and the confidence with which prolonged experience and matured learning surrounded him enabled him from the first to move without hesitation to the ends in view, and won for him the grateful respect ever accorded to rulers, whether in Church or State, who, on well-considered grounds and with kindness to those who differ from them, possess the increasingly rare gift of making up their minds, and, while giving all legitimate opinions fair play, taking with dignity and power a distinct line of their own. In the *Miscellanies* and *Five Charges*, one of which has been placed at the head of this notice, we find, as in a *speculum episcopi*, the development and application of the line of teaching and government followed by Bishop Wordsworth.

That line has been simply an adaptation of Anglo-Catholic principles to the needs of the age in which he has exercised the functions of the episcopate. For the true principles of the Church of England, 'the principles of evangelical doctrine, of apostolical order, and of catholic love,'<sup>1</sup> the Bishop has seen no reason to apologize, but with tenacious grasp of first principles he has combined true breadth

<sup>1</sup> *On the Controversy with Rome*, p. 8.

of view for present needs. The first five centuries, and the seventeenth, with its motto, '*Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi*,' were never long out of mind. But it has been the inner spirit and not the outward form of these centuries which has shaped work at Lincoln, while the lessons of the Middle Ages and of the Georgian era have not been lost.

The diocese has not been suffered to forget that it is a part, not of the Church of England merely, but of the Church of God. In 1870, 'Alexander Lycurgus, Archbishop of Syros, Tenos, and Delos, and other islands of the Ægean,' visited Riseholme, and was present at the consecration of the Bishop-Suffragan of Nottingham, 'on the Festival of the Presentation of Christ in the Temple, February 2, in S. Mary's Church in that town.' In the Diocesan Synod, held at Lincoln on September 20, 1871, 'the present condition of Christendom' stood first among the *Agenda*, for 'in the mystical Body of Christ, when one member suffers, the other members suffer with it,' and a resolution was adopted expressive of sympathy with the 'Old Catholics' of Germany; while the Bishop 'was authorized by the Synod to address a letter in its name, assuring them of the interest we feel in their work, and of the hope we entertain of their success.' In September 1872, the Bishop, earnestly requesting the prayers of the diocese in its behalf, attended the Congress of Old Catholics at Cologne, and the link of connexion with a movement in which the Bishop saw great possibilities has always been maintained.<sup>1</sup> Bishops Reinkens and Herzog were welcomed in Lincoln in November 1881, when the diocese, which at Boston still preserves the memory of S. Botolph's honoured name, 'renewed its spiritual communion of the seventh century with Germany.' To Lincoln it became natural for American and Colonial Bishops to find their way on visits to England, to take counsel with one who was not only 'the evangelical doctor,' but 'the beloved evangelist,' to address the students of the Scholæ Cancellarii, or to speak at the annual S.P.G. anniversary, when they found that special features of interest in their work were all carefully noted in the opening addresses of the chairman. At Lincoln, too, after two experiments of its observance at Rogationtide, the day of intercession for missions remained as heretofore fixed for S. Andrew's Day, or one of the seven days after it, and the Bishop never failed to encourage its observance by his presence in the cathedral. Interest in foreign missions was, indeed, one of the tests (preparation of candidates for Con-

<sup>1</sup> *Miscellanies*, i. pp. 285, 449. 441.

firmat  
have  
their r

'W  
Son of  
save hi  
and the  
which s  
of the c  
Blood t  
forth an

It  
acted i  
tion of  
Laws  
regardi  
as a sa  
on the  
tion in  
other C  
is any  
law and  
to cons  
posed o

And  
present  
every  
Christe  
Englan  
apostol  
of the c  
for had  
Grosset  
Bishop,  
not, wit  
visitation  
Chapter  
of Statu  
Alnwick  
tion and

<sup>1</sup> *Irie*  
<sup>2</sup> Lett  
Board of  
<sup>3</sup> Lau  
the Archb  
VOL. 2



firmation being the other) by which the clergy of the diocese have been bidden 'to try the faithfulness and efficiency of their ministry.'

'We are all members one of another. By His Incarnation the Son of God has joined all men as brethren in Himself. No one can save his own soul, unless he endeavours to save the souls of others; and the best way to save ourselves is to try to save others. A parish which selfishly wraps itself up in its own individuality knows nothing of the communion of saints and of the love of Christ, who shed His Blood to save the world, and gave command to His disciples to go forth and evangelize it.'<sup>1</sup>

It has been upon a similar principle that the Bishop has acted in regard to matters affecting the internal administration of the diocese. After, *e.g.*, the passage of the Burial Laws Amendment Act, 1880, it appeared to him impossible, regarding consecration as a solemn religious act, 'to set apart as a sacred gift to Almighty God' what might be 'desecrated on the next day after consecration.' He 'felt some consolation in being able to shelter himself under the authority of other Christian Churches,' for he did not believe 'that there is any Church in Christendom—guiding itself by ecclesiastical law and usage—which would empower and authorize a Bishop to consecrate a burial-ground under the conditions now imposed on such places in England' since 1880.<sup>2</sup>

And if living connexion with the Church Catholic of the present has been ever prominently put forward, and if in every change a review of the condition of Continental Christendom was given, the continuity of the Church of England was proclaimed far and wide by the successor of that apostolic Bishop of Lincoln, S. Hugh. In 1873 the visitation of the cathedral was revived after a lapse of about 120 years: for had not one of the most eminent Bishops of Lincoln, Robert Grossetête, in a letter written about A.D. 1240, said that 'a Bishop, who is not hindered by insuperable impediments, cannot, without peril to his own soul, omit the duty of holding visitations; and, above all' (he adds) 'ought he to visit the Chapter of his Cathedral Church'? In the next year the Digest of Statutes, the *Novum Registrum* and *Laudum*<sup>3</sup> of William Alnwick, Bishop A.D. 1436-1450, the framer of the Constitution and Statutes of Eton, *nunc primum in lucem edita*, were

<sup>1</sup> *Triennial Addresses*, &c., p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Charles Foster Bonner, Esq., Chairman of the Spalding Board of Improvement Commissioners (October 1880).

<sup>3</sup> *Laudum* means a Decision by Arbitrament. See *The Cathedral*, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 16; *Miscellanies*, vol. iii. p. 307.

placed anew in the hands of each member of the Cathedral body, and in all the manifold researches which have gone on at Lincoln, alike in the Muniment Room and Diocesan Registry, the Bishop's interest has been constant. But as opportunity offered, parish after parish learnt from its diocesan the part which it had played in making English Church history. No church re-opening could be complete without the Bishop's presence, his sermon, and his blessing on work which was never *their's*, or *your's*, but *our's*, and the fineness of the day and the largeness of the congregation were matters of quite as much interest to the chief pastor of the diocese as to the country villagers, in whose eyes the event was, perhaps, the most important within the century. At Clew we hear how S. Hugh desired that 'this church should be a Beersheba, a well-spring of evangelic truth.' At Bardney a favourite text, 'Thou shalt be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in,' formed the motto for lessons from the history of the ancient abbey of Saxon foundation. At Colsterworth, the birthplace of Sir Isaac Newton, the parishioners, in whose church 'Newton prayed to God, and praised Him, and listened to His Holy Word,' were invited to consider 'how the natural world is a parable of the world of grace.' At S. Paul-in-the-Bail (Paulinus's church), Lincoln, the Bishop and his hearers, assembled 'on a spot which was intersected by three great ancient military Roman roads,' 'were brought face to face with the ancient Roman world;' and this suggested salutary lessons on the failure of civilization apart from God incarnate, Jesus Christ, to regenerate society. A historical parallel between the state of England, A.D. 1640-1660 and in A.D. 1880, is drawn at Southwell, with its memories of Charles I., on May 30, the morrow of 'the restoration of the English Church and monarchy in 1660,' and lessons of faith, and hope, and love, form the sequel.<sup>1</sup> And if special history failed, then a coincidence with some event of general interest, or healthful teaching on the Prayer Book, or the functions of religious art, or music, or some archæological feature in the building, were called into requisition to mark the significance of the solemnity which had brought the Bishop to consecrate or re-dedicate the church.

But a Church must by organization justify its claim to continuity and become prepared for wider extensions, and hence Bishop Wordsworth's efforts were always strenuous for the restoration in various forms of synodical action. The

<sup>1</sup> 'A.D. 1640-1660. *Thoughts on the Times.*'

scarlet Convocation robes in the portrait which was presented to the Bishop of Lincoln in 1879 commemorate many an effort in this direction. Of his readiness to maintain the ancient privileges of the Houses of Convocation our readers will be fully cognizant; but events move so rapidly that the Diocesan Synod, attended by about 500 of the clergy, which was held in the cathedral church on September 20, 1871, has in the majority of notices of the Bishop's life been almost passed over. The holding of such a Synod, all the details of which had been carefully planned in accordance with ancient precedent, was to the Bishop 'a holy work,' and in such Synods he saw the way to a general agreement in regard to the sacred subjects which are the proper matters for their deliberation. But while the Bishop was rightly jealous of the peculiar functions to be performed by Diocesan Synods, he felt that, in addition to them,

'we need a Diocesan Conference, in which our lay brethren may be associated with us, and in which they may deliberate with us, not on controverted questions of theology, or on the settled Articles of our Faith, but on various topics which arise from time to time, and vitally affect the interests of religion and the Church.'

One of the results of the Synod was the formation of the Diocesan Conference in 1872, the proceedings of which have always been guided with increasing interest by the Bishop himself, while his inaugural address at its different sessions—as on the 'Burials Question' in 1877, 'the Law of Marriage and Divorce' in 1880, the 'Revised Version of the New Testament' in 1881, the 'Ecclesiastical Courts' in 1883, and 'John Wiclif' in 1884—have largely influenced public opinion. In the episcopate just beginning we feel sure that the Diocesan Synod will meet again, and more than once, so that

'by means of both we may hope to invigorate the old with what is new, and to consolidate the new with what is old; and thus, by not cutting off the entail of the past, but by gladly welcoming the present, and hopefully looking forward to the future, we may combine all ages together, and join them in a cordial embrace of Christian truth and Christian love.'

If, however, the Bishop expressed his need of the assent of the clergy to his recommendations in a Synod, he desired also their previous counsel, especially that of 'the capitular body, the *Senatus Episcopi*.' In the Charge of 1873 the whole Chapter was distinctly reminded that it had been, and in reality was still, 'the constitutional council of the Bishop.' Thanks to the Primate's work on *The Cathedral*, largely sug-

gested by his Grace's labours on the Lincoln Statutes, Bishop Wordsworth's ideal has now become the property of the Church, and as time goes on each Church-ruler will have his council, and with council, synod, and conference, episcopal authority will become the authoritative expression of general consent.

But as Bishop Wordsworth recognized the necessity and the value of the corporate action of the Church, he has ever been foremost in insisting on a lofty standard of devotion, piety, and learning, among the clergy, without whom, as he reminded the Synod, the Bishop should not act. 'We need,' he said, 'a learned ministry; especially we require a priesthood mighty in the Scriptures.' 'The teacher's error is the people's trial,' has become a well-known maxim, and the subject of devout study coupled with earnest exhortation to the cultivation of the fear of the Lord, which is the beginning of all wisdom, has never been omitted in the charges delivered with undeviating regularity at the Triennial Visitations. To the cathedral the Bishop looked for assistance alike in the conduct of ordinations, examinations, and in the training of candidates for Holy Orders. 'Our cathedral churches were intended to perform functions like those which were discharged of old by "the schools of the prophets" in the days of Samuel and Elijah.' And in the Chancellor of Lincoln, whose office it is 'scholas theologiæ regere; item in eisdem actualiter legere,' as well as to examine 'transmittendos ad ordines,' there was 'the theologian, the ecclesiastical professor and lecturer' ready for the purpose in view.<sup>1</sup> When these words were spoken, 'Chancellor Benson' had but lately come to Lincoln 'to serve memories that are green still, though they budded when Norman strove with Saxon, ere Saxon had done his strife with Briton,'<sup>2</sup> and to the joint efforts of the Bishop and the future Primate the restoration of the Scholæ Cancellarii in Lincoln Cathedral has, under God, been effected. The clergy trained at Lincoln have been mostly, though by no means exclusively, non-graduates, and the Bishop, sensible as he has ever been of the value of the University training and of the risks of imperfect scholarship, gave also frankest recognition to the ability, devotion, and work of others who had not received the education which he so highly prized. But his view of the question shall be given in words sanctioned by him in the Charge of 1879:

<sup>1</sup> *Statutes*, pp. 23, 24 (*De Officio et Potestate Cancellarii*).

<sup>2</sup> *Boy Life*, 'The Treasure of Treasures,' p. 371.

'It should be remembered—

(i.) That undoubtedly the ancient Universities cannot supply the number of men required for Holy Orders.

(ii.) That there is a work and a place for non-graduates, especially in town populations, though every work and every place will not suit them.

(iii.) That the diaconate and priesthood are *vocations*; and that, if a man is in God's counsel and providence called to these, we have no right to shut him out because of social position, or inability to spend three years at a University.'

Accordingly, everything that could be done to make the training of the restored cathedral school as comprehensive, large, and dignified as might be, was attempted by the Bishop, who, like S. Charles Borromeo, certainly 'watched over the whole as the dearest of his obligations.' Rooms in the old palace were from the first assigned for lectures. Then with a fund raised by public subscription to meet the costs incurred in 'the great Coates simony case,' the tower, 'shaded by its stately sycamore,' built by Bishop Alnwick, the guide and adviser of Henry VI. in the erection of the sister foundations of Eton and King's Colleges, was restored for the use of the *Scholæ*. The gift of a most pleasant house, known as 'Lindum Holme,' where the beginnings of common life were laid, quickly followed, and then a spacious building 'in a noble site,' with the cathedral on one side and the castle erected by the Conqueror on the site of strongholds yet more ancient on the other, 'provided rooms for all our students.' This had been the old County Hospital, and, when presented by the Bishop, the diocese gave kindest aid to a fund through which it was amply furnished. This is now 'the Bishop's Hostel.'

At the *Scholæ* the Bishop was visitor in fact as well as in name. New students were admitted with his blessing in a form of service specially prepared, and there is not a student, it has been said by one who knows the whole body well, 'who has passed through the college who does not regard him with the reverence and love of a son in Christ.' So long as the exertion was possible, a lecture on the Greek Testament was given once or twice a term; in the formation and growth of a Missionary Guild, the day of whose inauguration was to the Bishop 'a great day,' counsel and encouragement were always forthcoming, and Lincoln students have laboured in Ceylon, Allahabad in North India, Central Africa, Sierra Leone (where devotion to work involved the sacrifice of a very saintly life), Singapore, and New South Wales; from their Bishop the students heard many an address either on topics of

the day or great lessons of the past, as when a parallel was drawn between the circumstances of Archbishop Benson's Primacy and those under which his predecessor in the chancellorship, Richard Weathershed (A.D. 1221-1229), found himself called to the same high office in the reign of Henry III.; but above all the chief anxiety has been that our future clergy who should go forth to apply to others 'the true healing which flows from the pierced side of Christ' should 'first be cleansed themselves by keeping close to the healing stream and drinking largely of the living waters.' For the students also the Bishop wrote his *Ethica et Spiritualia*, 'libellum mole exiguum, sed, ni spes nos fallat, vobis non injucundum futurum neque infructuosum,' while it was 'in usum scholarum Cancellarii Lincoln.' that Chancellor Benson composed his *Practical Hints on Reading and some Prayings*, dedicated 'Episcopo vere nostro in lectione in orationibus incessabili.' It has been a picture drawn in fair colours set off by a framework in which archæology, and history, and choral worship have each added gifts of grace and strength and beauty, and those who have watched the progress of the picture know that, in the coming years, its lustre will remain undimmed.

A diocese so strengthened by living unity with the whole body of Christ, compacted by Synod and Conference, and quickened by growing devotion among its clergy, necessarily exhibited signs of progress alike in the regular and evangelistic work of the Church. The Bishop's own first cares have been his ordinations and confirmations, both most carefully administered. It was at Lincoln that the example of dividing the examination from the Embertide devotional preparation was first set, while on each of the three days previous to the ordination there was always a celebration of the Holy Eucharist. Nothing could be kinder than the reception which those who have been ordained by him met with at Risholme, where all the Bishop's energies were devoted to them. 'In none of the Confirmations administered by me,' he said in his latest Charge, 'have more than two candidates been ever confirmed at once.' He felt that, although this 'greatly increases the labour of Confirmation,' 'it is labour well bestowed;' and as to age there were no restrictions, for 'spiritual gifts are not to be measured by days, months, and years.' The cathedral planted on its 'sovereign hill,' like 'a Christian Parthenon on a Christian Acropolis,' had, as it were, in ancient times, 'a spiritual presence commensurate with the diocese.' 'The spiritual life of the diocese flowed from the cathedral as its fountain, like the mystic river in

Ezek  
wate  
has  
Und  
train  
Ther  
and  
year  
celeb  
ceed  
prod  
but  
disting  
powe

M  
of its  
tête's  
rema  
catho  
trast  
it'

patr  
Wor  
have  
new  
two  
almo  
prov  
fair  
of d  
the  
fema  
sing  
pital  
dema  
of th  
exce  
exte  
has  
fabri  
catho  
and

S  
into  
thor



Ezekiel's vision, which welled from beneath the altar and watered the land, and cleansed the dead sea,' and the Bishop has pointed the way to a restoration of that earlier activity. Under its shadow, as we have seen, future clergy are being trained. There all the general ordinations were conducted. There too, before the altar, the clergy were solemnly instituted and licensed, vested in the robes of their priesthood, and there year by year, on the anniversary of his consecration, the Bishop celebrated the Holy Eucharist; from the cathedral, too, proceeded in February, 1876, the 'Lincoln Mission,' which has produced abundant and abiding fruits, not only in that city, but throughout the Church of England, for more than one distinguished missionary gained in that effort consciousness of power of which up to that time he had been scarcely aware.

Next to its cathedral, Lincoln itself has been the object of its Bishop's thoughts. The city, even before Bishop Grossetête's time, has formed the Rural Deanery of Christianity, 'a remarkable word, as showing that the neighbourhood of the cathedral was regarded as a luminous spiritual Goshen, contrasted with the Egypt of *paganism*, properly so called, around it.' Of every church save two the Bishop is patron, and no patron was ever more careful of his charge than Bishop Wordsworth. Encouraged by their Bishop, clergy and people have also done their part. During the last sixteen years six new churches have been built, five replacing older structures; two have been enlarged; one so restored as to have become almost a new building; and the remaining four greatly improved. At the Training College for Schoolmistresses a fair chapel has been built, which has not only been a centre of devotion for the students, but, with its organ, 'has lifted the music of the institution to the first place among the female colleges;' another chapel has been added to the singularly complete and admirably managed County Hospital. Lincoln is free from a School Board. As each fresh demand of H.M. Inspectors has been presented, the liberality of the Church has met the need by the erection of eight excellent new schools. Sunday schools have been largely extended, and united into an association of which the Bishop has been Visitor, and, unobtrusively and quietly, the spiritual fabric has been growing with the material. No provincial cathedral city can, we believe, vie with the churchmanship and the unity of Lincoln.

So the diocese has been quickened by infusing new vigour into old institutions. At each important centre most thorough work is going forward; many country villages have

been the scene of self-denying pastoral labour and of literary work, to which the Bishop gave personal encouragement; and so long as Nottingham, with its adjacent collieries, remained in the diocese, it was the subject of the Bishop's most anxious care. The 'Church School Board,' co-extensive with the borough, formed in 1883, was but one example of his efforts on behalf of that great community, while prayer, and thought, and large munificence were freely lavished on the foundation of the Bishopric of Southwell, in which town Bishop Jackson had given it as 'his deliberate opinion' that the see of the Diocese of Nottingham should be. The regard and attachment felt for Bishop Wordsworth in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham found expression in a memorial address, forming a fitting counterpart to the resolution of sympathy offered with emotion so true and genuine by the Lincoln Conference a few weeks earlier.

Nor has the Bishop been, at any time, unmindful of the Church's evangelistic and aggressive work, or of plans of social philanthropy. At Burgh-le-Marsh he dedicated in 1878 S. Paul's Mission House for the reception and training of missionary students, for the most part, preparatory to the College of S. Augustine's. Over the growth of that thoroughly successful institution he has watched as Visitor, keenly interested in its progress. Visitor too he has been of that band of Mission Preachers known as the 'Novate Novale' (Hosea x. 12, Vulg.) of which the first warden was Chancellor Benson, and there are few of the smaller pieces in the *Miscellanies* more beautiful and characteristic than the prayers prepared for use on the occasion of the presentation of a ring, 'the emblem of Eternity; the seal of Faith; and the symbol of Charity;' and a cross 'in the Name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, and Him crucified,' to Dr. Benson, by the members of the society, on his designation for the see of Truro. Twice in every year 'the Bishop's Hostel' receives members of 'the Novate' and other clergy for a retreat or day of prayer, and many a country clergyman has found, through union with the Society, new interest in his work. No truer exposition of the principles of mission work has ever been given than that comprised in the pastoral letters and addresses connected with the Lincoln mission of 1876.

The work undertaken by the Church to improve the social condition of the people met with no grudging response from Bishop Wordsworth. A flourishing club and institute for men and boys in a poor parish in Lincoln owes its prosperity largely to his munificence, and in speaking to some lads there in the closing months of his episcopate, he claimed all their

amus  
tian's  
he sa  
by cu  
He f  
by h  
heart  
expli  
tion,  
have  
which  
he di  
Engl  
provi  
diate  
'Hyn  
tiful  
temp  
O  
left o  
Salis  
upon  
mem  
long  
witho  
such  
into  
adop  
its au  
and t  
obsen  
Sakra  
is 'th  
Char  
prom  
point  
we th  
and,  
Colle  
bridg  
or St

1 2  
of Tea  
2 1  
Liddo

amusements and all their games as part of the true Christian's life. Certainly, in regard either to purity or temperance, he said that 'we must not dwarf and maim our teaching by eulogies of one virtue, or by invectives against one vice.'<sup>1</sup> He felt, also, that 'we must endeavour to reform society, not by human means, but by the work of God's *grace on the heart*.' But against darker forms of evil he spoke out with explicit clearness, mindful, however, of an Apostolic injunction, Ephesians v. 12, which some earnest people seem to have forgotten. If he protested against the extravagances which have impeded the promotion of temperance principles, he did not hesitate to give hearty support to the Church of England Temperance Society, a flourishing branch of which, provided with a manual of prayer, composed under his immediate direction, awaits the approbation of Dr. King. In a 'Hymn for Temperance' the Bishop expounds with beautiful simplicity the real theological basis on which all true temperance work must be grounded.

Of other forms of Bishop Wordsworth's activity we have left ourselves no space to speak. Like Bishop Hamilton, of Salisbury, he set much store upon the *jus liturgicum* which, upon ancient principles, is inherent, within limits, in every member of the Episcopate.<sup>2</sup> The clergy were never left for long without forms of prayer for special emergencies, nor without guidance how to act under circumstances of difficulty such as those which the Burial Laws Amendment Act called into existence. In the table of Proper Psalms and Lessons adopted by the Synod of 1871, the Diocese of Lincoln has its authorized 'use,' much to the edification of its inhabitants and the regularity of its ritual. Practical directions as to the observance of Church seasons and the celebration of the Sacraments, and that 'intelligent *reading* of Scripture' which is 'the best *preaching*,' were never forgotten in the triennial Charges; and in the midst of unceasing pastoral activity, letters promptly answered, engagements punctually kept, and appointments quickly settled, the Bishop's literary work (crowned, we think, by his *Church History*), attendance at Convocation, and, when necessary, in the House of Lords, oversight of the Colleges of which he was *ex-officio* Visitor at Oxford and Cambridge, and keen interest in public events, whether in Church or State, were never intermitted.

<sup>1</sup> *Triennial Addresses*, &c., pp. 98-103. This section on 'Narrowness of Teaching on Morality' deserves very careful attention.

<sup>2</sup> *Walter Kerr Hamilton, Bishop of Salisbury: a Sketch*, by Canon Liddon, p. 85.

To many of these labours, however, full justice has been elsewhere done, and we have preferred to speak of the practical issues of a distinct faith resting on the great objective verities of the Divine Revelation, finding in the Divine glory a principle even higher than the salvation of mankind, deriving ever fresh strength from conscious contact with the whole mystical Body of Christ, not advancing one step beyond limits imposed on human reason by an all-wise Creator, and strong in patience, due to an absolute confidence in the presence of the Holy Ghost with the Church of England, now as heretofore, in every stage of her marvellous history. The episcopate of Bishop Wordsworth has added yet another proof to the many accumulated within the present century of the living power of Anglo-Catholic theology and practices; and it has been the knowledge that the character which underlay the work was one 'that spread itself out in the sight of all, and lived constantly in the presence of Christ,'<sup>1</sup> which has given that work, through God's grace, a moral value of the highest kind. For the gift of that example, and that faith, fresh to the end, which no difficulties could daunt, we thank God. The whole Anglican Communion will be permanently enriched by it.

Writing this sketch of his episcopate before the end had come, we had ventured to add yet more assurance of the respectful sympathy and unflinching prayer which were rising around him that, in the words of the resolution passed by the Bishops in Convocation, 'he might be supported, cheered, and comforted in his day of trial by the grace of God and the light of His countenance.' That day of trial was certainly heavy and prolonged. Sorrow for her loss whose devotion to her home and her Church had been so constant and self-forgetting had, it was known, added much to physical weakness and distress. But throughout the pain and sorrow he has been teaching the Church. When the new aisle of a church in one of the poorest parishes of Lincoln, built at his own cost, was opened, he wrote to say that, had he been able, 'he would have preached on the spiritual benefits of sickness and affliction, which is the common lot of all, as a blessed season for the exercise of patience and repentance, and of trust in God's Fatherly love, and of faith in the merits of our Saviour Christ, and of humble hope that if we follow Him in suffering we shall hereafter be partakers of His glory.' 'It is my earnest prayer,' he added, 'that this blessed comfort may be

<sup>1</sup> The Archbishop of Canterbury, February 9, 1885.

yours.  
of the  
after '  
work,'  
not be  
includi  
license  
nation,  
his suc  
nomin.  
peace,  
salvati  
passed  
origina  
rest on  
nation,  
spring  
work th  
through  
young  
gift, in  
concou  
light fe  
and the  
so lovi  
known  
which I  
attachm  
evidenc

ART

Church  
Re  
'C  
of

WE can  
improve  
must ne

yours.' There followed without hesitation the announcement of the resignation of the Bishopric as soon as it became plain, after 'a respite of about four months from active episcopal work,' that ability to resume it would 'in all human probability' not be given. Acts of munificence and kindly consideration, including the gift of the Commentary on the Bible to every licensed curate of the diocese, accompanied the act of resignation, and not thanksgiving only but generous confidence in his successor prompted him to say on hearing of Dr. King's nomination, 'Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word; for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.' A few hours after that successor's election he passed quietly away. 'At or about Lady Day' he had originally purposed to resign, and most fitly was he laid to rest on a festival commemorating the great fact of the Incarnation, belief in which had from youth to age been the main-spring of a life in which from the first glimpse to the perfect work the same idea was dominant. As he was reverently borne through the great western doorway of the Cathedral by the young students of the College which had been altogether his gift, in the presence of the Primate of All England and a great concourse of clergy and lay people, while a gleam of soft light fell on the white flowers, which told of purity and hope, and the pastoral staff lying over him, which spoke of the charge so lovingly fulfilled, so cheerfully resigned, they who had known and worked under him felt that of the many reasons which he had given them for firm faith in our Lord and loyal attachment to their mother Church, the most convincing evidence had, through the grace of God, been himself.

---

#### ART. IX.—THE ATHANASIAN CREED AGAIN ASSAILED.

*Churchmen, Hear! A Further Remonstrance against the Recital of the Athanasian Creed; being a Reply to the 'Church Quarterly Review,' with Addenda. By a Member of the Church of England. (London, 1885.)*

WE cannot say that this second 'Remonstrance' exhibits any improvement in tone. There is even an increase of what we must needs call ungraceful self-assertion. The writer speaks

as if he had somehow a right to pose as patron and monitor of the whole Church of England, without letting that right be tested by the mention of his name. We trust that no defender of an ecclesiastical or ritual *status quo* would so far forget modesty, not to say reverence, as to place on the title-page of a second pamphlet the solemn text which closes the story of the roll burned by Jehoiakim, 'And there were added besides unto them many like words,'—with due reference to chapter and verse; or to print in small capitals at the end of his preface an exhortation beginning, '*Believe me*, there is a higher wisdom for the representatives of the Church to manifest,' &c. We never before saw the anonymous in such close union with the dictatorial. We should much exceed any reasonable limits if we quoted all the passages (*e.g.* pp. 51–5, 59, 61, 67, 76) in which the writer, as if unconscious of the impression he is making, goes on begging questions with immovable self-confidence, and imposing his own view as if from the chair of a lay pontiff. He describes the eminent theologians who differ from him as 'seeming to lose their fine heads and to flounder in quagmires. *But that is as it ought to be*, and is an appropriate retribution for the abuse of their great powers,' &c. (p. 60). Is this the good taste of an English gentleman? Is this the decorum of a modern controversialist? What would be said by lay opinion of any clergyman who dealt in such language? Are clerical readers to learn from this non-clerical writer *furens quid laicus possit*? In the last page of this 'Remonstrance' he takes credit for not having 'framed a pungent satire.' There is one quality of the satirist in which he is certainly deficient: he has not the faintest sense of humour. As for denunciatory phrases, which he euphemistically describes as 'expressive' (p. 10), there is a fresh crop of them: 'fierce menaces of the Church's degenerate sons, whom dogmatic and ecclesiastical fighting had rendered harsh and unmerciful, tyrannical and cruel' (p. 15), 'harsh and threatening . . . offensive chorus' (p. 19), 'horrid words' (p. 46), 'unearthly, unheavenly, ungodly threats' (p. 47), 'barbarous warnings' (p. 50), 'direful predictions' (p. 51), 'the second clause of the *Quicumque* an unmitigated, shameful, and most injurious lie' (p. 53), 'prejudice, sophistry, intolerance, the spirit of domination, slavery, traditionalism and conventionalism, a grievous inertia as to the disturbing of old usage, a false sense of duty' (p. 54), 'antiquated anachronisms and barbarous blunders' (p. 67), 'the barbarous chorus . . . this offensive thing' (p. 70), 'those menacing falsehoods . . . the weird chorus' (p. 71), &c. In this same

last  
are p  
throu  
the la  
educ  
such  
to co  
an 'a

T  
which  
Quar  
sleep  
even  
Quic  
he di  
says,  
then,  
raised  
he sa  
spent  
Quic  
argue  
Coun  
that  
where  
the A  
his an  
nothi  
to th  
partic  
again  
have  
stater  
that I  
que, b  
there:  
'neve  
nor th  
to dv  
mind  
is one  
will, i  
natur  
prefer  
'the



last page he 'could wish, whenever the barbarous untruths are proclaimed, that the word *Silence!* might reverberate through every church in the land!' in defiance, we presume, of the law against 'brawling in church.' Is it impossible for an educated and well-intentioned layman, when he undertakes such a responsibility as is involved in these 'Remonstrances,' to comprehend that such scolding and railing as this is itself an 'anachronism' which would prejudice any cause?

To notice, in the first place, two charges of unfairness which he brings against ourselves. We had cited (*Church Quarterly Review*, xviii. 374) his adoption of the adage, 'Let sleeping dogs lie,' adding the expression of his not wishing even to disturb men's belief in the 'dogmatism' of the *Quicumque*. He says we ought to have known that by 'dogs' he did not mean the dogmas, but the 'questions'—now, he says, dormant—about those dogmas. Be it so: but why, then, did he go on to point out objections which could be raised against the dogmas? So, in his new pamphlet (p. 61), he says, 'I would let the *dogmas* alone;' and yet he has spent pages in trying to prove that the 'definitions' of the *Quicumque* are 'bewildering' and incoherent. Again, he had argued that the *Quicumque* had no authority of a General Council, and was of uncertain origin; and he now complains that we simply retorted, 'What of the Apostles' Creed?' whereas the *Quicumque* was open to objections from which the Apostles' Creed was clear. He adds that we passed over his argument from that difference. We answer that we did nothing of the kind, for we met the objections which he took to the matter of the *Quicumque*, and also showed that one particular argument of his against it would tell by itself against the older symbol. We are sincerely glad, however, to have elicited from the Remonstrant some much more explicit statements of his own personal belief. He tells us repeatedly that he has no objection to 'the main dogmas of the *Quicumque*, broadly stated' (p. 16), or 'the great truths declared' therein (p. 55). Yet more expressly, he protests that he has 'never doubted the true divinity and incarnation of our Lord, nor the divinity of the Holy Ghost' (p. 22). We do not wish to dwell on a passage in which, preferring to represent the mind of the Apostles, he makes them say that the Son of God is one 'with the Father in character, in wisdom, in favour, in will, in authority, and in word,' without adding 'in being or nature' (p. 37). The omission is rather ominous; but we prefer to dwell on the twice-repeated acknowledgment that 'the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is

God, and yet they are not three Gods, but one God; and that our one Lord is both God and Man,' or 'that the Son of God became the Son of Man' (pp. v. 13). It is matter of true satisfaction to obtain this plain assurance. We feel that we have really common ground with the writer; and we can proceed, not altogether unhelpfully, to assure him that, since he believes this, he believes, at any rate implicitly, all that is required of him by the *Quicumque* in regard to the Trinity and the Incarnation. Because he believes the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit to be severally God, according to the fifteenth and nineteenth verses of this Creed, he in effect accepts the fifth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, thirteenth, seventeenth, and twenty-fourth verses. Because he believes the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit to be not three Gods but one God, according to the sixteenth and twentieth verses, he virtually accepts the sixth, eleventh, twelfth, fourteenth, and eighteenth verses. His own admission shows that he 'worships one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity'—that is, the One God as revealed in Three whom, for want of a better term, we call Persons, and those Three as being yet the One God. He 'neither confounds the Persons nor divides the Substance.' If he scruples at 'Not three Eternals,' &c., let him observe that it is simply a variation of 'Not three Gods.' And what is further said of the Father as unbegotten, of the Son as begotten, of the Holy Spirit as proceeding, and of the Three as coeternal and coequal, can present no real difficulties to a Christian thinker who unites the above-cited confession with a sincere belief in that unity and simplicity of the One adorable Nature which can admit of no partition and can tolerate no 'more or less.' The 'a Filio' of verse 23 may be, for all we know, a stumbling-block to his mind; but, at any rate, as we showed in our former article, one who took the Eastern view of the Procession, or questioned the Western view, might still acknowledge with perfect faith the doctrine as summarized in verses 3-6 and 27. If our Remonstrant will think this matter out, without excitement or prejudice, he will, we trust, come to see that all the talk about 'puzzles,' and 'disputable points,' and 'entangling propositions' or 'dogmatisms,' and 'ensnaring definitions,' and 'exacting subtleties,' and 'abstruse phrases and definings,' and all the rest of it, is really beside the point, is the result of a mere misapprehension. He says he has 'not evaded one of' our 'criticisms' (p. 65); we answer that he has utterly passed by the main point on which, following Dr. Mozley, we dwelt in our article (*C. Q. R.* xviii. 380-385)—i.e. that verse after verse in both parts of the *Quicumque*

cons  
men  
give  
ther  
whic  
belie  
'red  
thro  
whic  
'  
powe  
and  
disbe  
for d  
do no  
this.'

V  
Rem  
of th  
'ana  
read  
atten  
ancie  
cunq  
izing  
says  
lation  
yet,  
grou  
Fath  
and y  
asser  
recon  
New  
but it  
fill th  
The  
plain  
A  
New  
rally,  
strant

consists simply of an illustration and reiteration of the fundamental proposition, to which, on his own showing, our author gives his adhesion, and to the logical contents of which he thereby commits himself. Let him test this by considering which of these assertions can be denied without impairing belief in the proposition which, as Dr. Mozley says, they 'reduplicate, and unfold by equivalent terms, and carry through different forms of language,' but to the substance of which they 'add nothing' whatsoever.

'I cannot conceive,' says Dr. Mozley, 'such a type of reasoning power as would admit that the Son was God and the Holy Ghost God, and yet not allow them the attributes of God. If a person, then, disbelieves the doctrine of the Trinity, he has the best of all reasons for disbelieving the Athanasian Creed; but if he believes it, then I do not see what else he has to believe in the Athanasian Creed but this.'<sup>1</sup>

We need not carry this out as to the Incarnation. The Remonstrant can hardly be serious in putting the antitheses of the *Quicumque* in parallelism with the minute and elaborate 'analysis' into which some divines have entered. We are most ready to admit that some language used by theologians has attempted too much in the way of 'philosophizing' on the 'most ancient of all mysteries;' but we wholly deny that the *Quicumque* uses that sort of language. It pointedly avoids theorizing as to how this and that can be true together. Our author says that 'it does not speculate itself, but it engenders speculation in its hearers'—e.g. 'the Father is Eternal,' &c. 'And yet,' &c. (p. 39). Why, does he forget that precisely the same ground could be taken against his own admission 'that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet they are not three Gods but one God'? The simplest assertion which we can make about the One God suggests recondite thoughts and questionings. 'Say,' writes Cardinal Newman, 'that no other religious ideas whatever were given but it' (i.e. 'the being of a God'), 'and you have enough to fill the mind; you have at once a whole dogmatic system. The word God is a theology in itself.'<sup>2</sup> Our author, too plainly, has never got below the surface in these matters.

As for the diversity between Bishop Kaye and Cardinal Newman, we conceive that the former, not, perhaps unnaturally, somewhat misunderstood the latter; and the Remonstrant overlooks the fact that Cardinal Newman repeatedly

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Lectures on University Education*, p. 45.

excludes Sabellianism by calling the Divine Three 'eternally distinct Persons,' and also 'correlatives,' not 'relations,' the Three having relations to each other. But to illustrate this further would take up too much of our space. It is more relevant to observe that the difficulties which are conjured up as capable of being raised against the received statements on the Trinity are only specimens of a class; that other objectors might, and indeed *do*, raise other difficulties against such statements as the Remonstrant himself puts forward at p. 37 and elsewhere; let us speak quite plainly—against the very idea of a Living God who is at once Infinite and 'Personal.' There are those who would quickly enough turn our author's supposed objections to 'tri-personality' against any ascription of 'personality' to God. In short, he has stated, hypothetically at least, objections which will carry him much further than he knows of. One characteristic of his reasoning is that he does not see when he has proved too much. We must notice another point. The Remonstrant may, we trust, be led to consider what is involved in his acceptance of the Nicene Creed; in spite of his dislike of the Homousion as 'unfortunate,' and of his strangely one-sided estimate of its results (p. 15), he yet believes that Christ is not only 'God,' but 'God of God, begotten, not made,' and therefore he cannot attach any real weight to the Arian arguments which he has virtually cited at pp. 30 ff. against the doctrine of an Eternal Sonship. He asks Dr. Liddon to be content with those safeguards of the essential doctrine of the Divine Trinity which are found in other parts of the Prayer Book. But surely he cannot forget that all blows aimed at the so-called 'scientific' language of the *Quicumque* about 'three Persons and one God' strike direct at the Litany as well. He cannot attack the one and defend the other; nor can he consistently attempt to take away the *Quicumque* from our Church service and allow us to keep the Proper Preface for Trinity Sunday. We go further, and say that we have no sort of right to worship Christ—e.g. in the *Te Deum* or the *Gloria in Excelsis*—unless He is really included within the incommunicable Deity; unless He, as Son of God, is uncreate, illimitable, eternal, almighty, and coequal. We have no sort of right to recite the *Gloria Patri*, unless we can predicate the same terms of the Holy Spirit. And we repeat that our Remonstrant will find it impossible to steer clear of 'difficulties' while drawing up any form of address to the Most High, or framing any formulary of belief. For he must, to some extent, speak of God theologically; and he cannot do

1885  
so v  
'm  
opp  
whic  
Thei  
I  
expr  
irrev  
woul  
Sabe  
A  
Rem  
the b  
place  
anath  
drew  
'neve  
recen  
to it;  
canon  
sies.  
Nicen  
as ma  
Creed  
third  
faith.  
matize  
of our  
nounce  
feeling  
though  
perfect  
Church  
State-f  
is much  
the co  
Absolu  
may, of  
of our  
Deity.  
subjects  
whose  
Jews, an  
strant's  
offended  
VOL. 1

so without the use of abstract terms which may be called 'man-made' or 'scientific,' and on which may be fastened the opprobrium of 'difficulty' or 'obscurity.' The 'metaphysics' which he dreads will attach to the simplest utterances of Theism.

Before we pass from this part of our subject, we must express astonishment at the grotesque and unintentionally irreverent attempt at p. 36 to say how the Council of Jerusalem would have addressed the Church in presence of Arianism or Sabellianism. Its presumption is portentous.

As to the warning clauses, against which, as before, the Remonstrant keeps up so hot a fire of abuse—for it passes all the bounds of grave objection—we must observe, in the first place, that he has not 'got up the facts' about the Nicene anathema. He thinks that the Council of Chalcedon 'withdrew' it from the Nicene Creed, and that afterwards it was 'never heard of' (pp. 14, 62). True, the Constantinopolitan recension, so-called, of that Creed has no anathema appended to it; but it is remarkable, at the same time, that the first canon of Constantinople has an anathema against all heresies. As for Chalcedon, that Council expressly recites the Nicene Creed with certain additions, but *with* the anathema, as may be seen in Dr. Hort's *Two Dissertations*; and the Creed was also thus repeated with the anathema at the third Council of Toledo, when Spain accepted the Catholic faith. And the notion that the Church ever ceased to 'anathematize' all heresies contradicting that faith is merely a proof of our Remonstrant's ignorance of the subject on which he pronounces so unhesitatingly. Again, the argument from the feelings of the Nonconformists is pressed at p. 20 without a thought of its logical issues. We are told that they 'have a perfect right to expect that no usages in the State-fostered Church shall be such as to offend their consciences.' (The State-fostered Church!) This 'right' we wholly deny. There is much in the system of the Church of England which offends the consciences of Nonconformists in regard to Baptism, Absolution, Ordination, and other subjects. The Unitarians may, of course, by equal right complain of the 'public idolatry' of our service, as constructed on the supposition of Christ's Deity. But what of the Roman Catholics, who are 'Christian subjects of the Queen and constituents of Parliament,' and in whose eyes the Established Church is heretical? What of Jews, and of unbelievers? In short, how far will the Remonstrant's maxim, that all English citizens have a right not to be offended by anything in the Established Church, carry him in

its logical application? We will tell him how far—to the destruction of the Establishment.

But to come nearer the point. Is there any moral harm in the rejection of any revealed or otherwise known truths? And if so, do any penalties attach to it? Is there such harm, and are there such penalties, with regard to the rejection of Theism in favour of Pantheism, Agnosticism, or Atheism? If so, then the doctrine, 'There is a God,' must have its warning clause by way of sanction; and at the same time it is as truly beset with speculative 'difficulties' as is the whole dogma of our First Article. Here is the point: if we once grant that this belief is 'necessary to salvation,' we are on the same ground, so far as principle goes, with the warning clauses of the *Quicunque*; we are dealing with a theological proposition of the extremest magnitude, bearing most closely on men's eternal interests, and therefore on the phenomena of human disbelief, with all the questions thereby suggested. Our author talks about 'honest reasoning constraining men to reject certain human representations of some of the truths of the Gospel, but never leading them to reject the Gospel itself' (p. 49). What? has he never heard of 'honest doubters' declaring that Christianity—that is, 'the Gospel'—as a religion, was to them incredible, or that the theory of a Divine personality was 'anthropomorphic' or 'unverifiable'? Is he so simple as to think that the problem of the consequences of unbelief can only present itself in connection with Trinitarian orthodoxy? Would that it were so! But so it is not, and the fact that it is not so disposes of his easy-going assumptions on this head. Men *do* reject God; not only God as we confess Him in the Creeds, but God as natural reason, in our view, presents Him to their acceptance. What will He do with them? How will He treat them? They may be as 'honest' in their disbelief as any of those 'who see reason not to keep' the faith set forth in the *Quicunque* (p. 52). For the former, as for the latter, we must somehow combine a 'warning clause' with such a mental explanation of its scope as the Divine equity must in either case impose.

And as to the moral 'threatenings' of Scripture, they too, like the doctrinal, must be mysterious in their application to individuals. Dr. Liddon's words, quoted by the Remonstrant, 'No human judgment can safely rule the fearful question to what individuals these clauses do apply,' have a bearing on the condemnation of 'idolaters' and of 'liars;' for who but the Supreme Judge can estimate the opportunities or the responsibilities, we do not say merely of the heathen who turns

awa  
und  
even  
have  
him,  
reve  
soul  
him  
Him  
large  
ficial  
Pers  
and  
into  
whic  
is me  
this,  
is th  
If it  
Chris  
sary  
at eve  
judgm  
at the  
make  
woul  
'soph  
shelte  
think  
words  
the co  
among  
then l  
sense

'If  
definite  
not sho  
faith, d  
one by  
ought  
... St  
explain  
The mi  
which y  
than in



away from a missionary, but of the poor rough lad who, under pressure of misery or bad companionship, forgets or even puts from him the lessons of truthfulness which he may have heard at his Sunday school? He, and thousands like him, do to all appearance live without God, apart from the revealed conditions of salvation; and yet He knows their souls, and knows, as we do not, how far those conditions affect him individually. We have to keep His law in view; it is for Him, in each case, to apply it. Let the Remonstrant take a larger view of the solemn question which he touches so superficially. If the statements of the *Quicumque* as to three Persons and one Substance, or Trinity in Unity, or co-eternity and co-equality, or 'one Christ by taking of the manhood into God,' are logically contained in the original propositions which he owns to be *de fide*, the sanction of the 'clauses' is measured by those propositions, and the question comes to this, whether a real faith in the Trinity and the Incarnation is that right faith which is necessary to Christian salvation? If it is not, what is? is any faith necessary? is faith in Christ's mission necessary? is faith in God's existence necessary? and the question of the future of disbelievers will recur at every step of this process; and a reference to God's equitable judgment will be equally inevitable, and equally reasonable, at the last step and at the first. If at the last step he were to make that reference, critics from the standpoint of unbelief would be ready enough to turn against himself the charge of 'sophistry and fencing' (p. 62); and he would then take shelter behind those very defences which now he seems to think that 'a fox could break down.' We will here cite some words from one of the most lucid pamphlets called forth by the controversy of 1872. Canon Woodgate, well known as among the acutest minds of the old Oxford school, and since then lost to the Church on earth, then wrote in his *Common-sense View of the Athanasian Creed Question* :—

'If you believe the declarations of Holy Scripture . . . that any definite faith is necessary to salvation, say what that faith is; but do not shelve or evade the question by platitudes about simplicity of faith, dislike of controversy, or the like. . . . If you will, strike out one by one the articles in the Athanasian Creed, the belief in which ought *not*, in your judgment, to enter into the terms of salvation. . . . Stop, if you will, at our Lord's Sonship. . . . If you are asked to explain the nature of the Sonship . . . you are bound to do so. . . . The minor proposition . . . must arise out of each succeeding one which you admit. This minor proposition is no less requisite in faith than in morals.'

To conclude. Our censor calls on the Church in general to give up the recitation of this formulary, without necessarily erasing it from the Prayer Book. Dean Goulburn, in 1872, curtly described this policy as that of 'muffling the Creed.' It is essentially an inconsistent policy; for the Prayer Book, as distinct from the Articles, is the 'Use' of the Church of England in regard to Divine worship. Logic would soon demand that the *Quicunque* should be relegated to a place among the Articles; and how long, we may ask, would it stand there? Our author encourages us to take the step he advocates by the examples of 'suppression' in America and of 'silencing' in Ireland. Surely we know a little too much of the circumstances under which, and the influences by which, the non-Eucharistic services of the Church were marred and mutilated by the Convention of 1789, at a period when theological and ritual knowledge was at its lowest; <sup>1</sup> a little too much, also, of the anti-Catholic fanaticism which animated the majority of lay representatives in the Irish 'Synod' of Revision. That Revision is a warning and not a precedent. Our author, with his curious simplicity, bids us believe that if we followed it in this particular, our act would be hailed with a 'Never too late to mend.' 'Depend upon it, if you do the really right thing, men of sense and reason will not long, if at all, misinterpret your motives; and if they did, you would at all events have done your duty.' Ay, but should we? That is just the question. Would it be a faithful act to deprive our people of such teaching as that of the *Quicunque* under pressure of an agitation partly ignorant, and partly hostile to dogma? Meantime, the Remonstrant may be assured that the Church will never undertake any liturgical revision so long as there is a necessity of submitting it to a modern Parliament; and that if the State were to impose such a revision on the Church, the advocates of Dis-establishment would see their work done to their hand.

<sup>1</sup> 'It would be impossible now to do the same act in the same easy and negative spirit in which it was done in America.'—Mozley, *Lectures*, &c., p. 191.

1. C

2. T

WE  
'Cler  
articl  
very  
And  
such  
deser  
left o  
grasp  
to th  
tendi  
indep  
seque

N  
than  
ing a  
in the  
large  
subje  
bearin  
which  
public  
clergy  
difficu  
cordia  
the fu  
stamp  
form

AN  
was he  
20, 18  
existin  
gentle  
ing th

1 'P  
and 'C

## ART. X.—CLERGY PENSIONS.

1. *Church Finance.* By the Rev. PREBENDARY WOOD. (London, 1874.)
2. *The Clergyman's Magazine*, February, 1882.

WE need hardly apologize for recurring to the subject of 'Clergy Pensions,' already treated in some of its aspects in two articles in this *Review*.<sup>1</sup> Since their appearance it has grown very largely in public, and more especially in clerical, interest. And that, not merely in view of the fact that without some such provision as may sustain existence in old age, many deserving clergy may, from want of professional success, be left destitute; but because the clergy have been quick to grasp our strongest point, the very great ulterior advantage to the Church itself which must result from any measure tending to encourage and stimulate the earlier resignation of independent clerical posts by elderly men, and their consequent earlier attainment by younger ones.

Nothing can be more natural, or indeed more desirable, than that the mooted measures towards effecting so promising an improvement in the conditions of clerical service and in the efficiency of the Church itself should suggest a very large number of proposals for dealing with so important a subject. Many persons, who have more or less studied the bearings of the question, have put forward schemes of action, which are at the present time, so to speak, in the crucible of public opinion; and those interested (as all our brethren of the clergy at least should be) in finding a good solution of the difficulties inherent in any reform whatever will surely join cordially with us in the hope that good results may flow from the fusion of all these different proposals, and come forth stamped with general approval and commendation in the form of a thoroughly sound and practical pension scheme.

An important meeting on the subject of Clergy Pensions was held at the National Society's Conference Room on January 20, 1885, to which, amongst others, the members of the already existing 'Clergy Pensions Union,' consisting of a number of gentlemen, either authors of, or interested in, proposals touching the subject, were invited. The chair was taken by the

<sup>1</sup> 'Position and Prospects of Curates,' in No. 27, vol. xiv., April 1882, and 'Clergy Pensions,' in No. 31, vol. xvi., April 1883.

Archdeacon of Middlesex, and a number of proposals were carefully discussed. A 'Clergy Pensions Committee' was nominated, which has since then held various meetings, and we are glad to say that there is every prospect of this important matter obtaining a prominent place in the discussions of the Church Congress to be held this year at Portsmouth.

We had hoped in the present paper to compare and discuss the different proposals, of which we subjoin the following brief summary.

### PROPOSED SCHEMES FOR CLERGY PENSIONS.

#### 1. REV. PREBENDARY WOOD, Christ Church, Bath.

##### OBJECTS.

- (A) '*Clergy Aid Fund*,' for Sick and Disabled Clergy.
- (B) '*Retiring Fund*,' for an Annuity at 65 years of age.

##### SOURCES OF INCOME.

- (A) 1. One tenth of all Sacramental Alms.
- 2. An annual Collection in every Church.
- (B) 1. Collections in Churches.
- 2. Contributions of Clergy.

The Fund to pay half the premium for the Annuity, the Clergyman the other half.

[See *Church Finance*. (WELLS GARDNER, 2, Paternoster Buildings).]

#### 2. REV. CANON BLACKLEY, Vicar of King's Somborne.

*Two Propositions.* OBJECT. Annuities for Clergy at 60 years of age.

- (A) All future Candidates for Holy Orders to be ordained deacon at 22 years of age, if willing, by paying down 50*l.*, to secure a Pension of 100*l.* per annum on attaining the age of 60.
- (B) The purchase, by a lump sum or instalments, of ten 10*l.* Annuities, payable on attaining the age of 60 years.

In both cases the pension of 100*l.* a year to be claimed only by Clergymen being *unbeneficed* at the time of making their claim, and able to prove 20 years' parochial work.

Provision for Widows and Orphans does not enter into this scheme.

##### SOURCES OF INCOME.

- (A) The 50*l.* deducted from the Curate's first year's stipend, which he could not otherwise earn at all in his 23rd year.
- (B) Annual payment (for ten successive years) by the Curate, assisted by one-tenth of Sacramental Alms in every Parish in which an Assistant Curate is employed, or by any other diocesan or general organization which may be formed to aid the insurance.

[See *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1882, and April 1883.]

3. Rev. GEORGE B. HOWARD, Oakhurst, Forest Hill, S.E.  
(Secretary to Clergy Friendly Society.)

## OBJECTS.

- (§ A) *Annuities for the Clergy.*  
(§ B) *Pensions for their Widows.*  
(§ C) *Allowances for their Orphan Children.*

## SOURCES OF INCOME.

- I. Subscriptions of Beneficiary Members in four classes at the option of the Subscriber, viz. :—

- § A. Class I. For an Annuity of £ 10, an annual premium of £  
II. Ditto ditto 20 ditto ditto  
III. Ditto ditto 30 ditto ditto  
IV. Ditto ditto 40 ditto ditto

- § B. (A) A donation paid by instalments within a certain period from date of marriage, or joining the Fund, with proportionate payments for disparity of age.

- (B) An annual premium according to the Class joined.

- § C. (A) A donation paid for each child placed on the Fund within a given period from birth.

- (B) An annual premium as in § B.

2. Church collections and other subscriptions, donations, &c.

APPLICATION of (2), the *augmentation* of the benefits derived from insurance as above (1), thus :—

## Class I.

Division I. Net income not exceeding 125*l.* for past five years, a fourfold rate of augmentation.

II. Net income from 125*l.* to 250*l.* for past five years, a threefold rate of augmentation.

III. Net income from 250*l.* to 375*l.* for past five years, a double rate of augmentation.

IV. Net income from 375*l.* to 500*l.* for past five years, a single rate of augmentation.

V. Net income above 500*l.* for past five years, no augmentation.

In Classes II., III., IV., the rate of augmentation to be gradually lessened.

N.B.—(1). A Clergyman must have subscribed 37 (or 32) years to claim an augmentation on his own pension.

(2) The Scheme to apply to all in Priest's Orders, whether benefited or unbenefited.

[See article in *Churchman's Shilling Magazine*, January 1883.]

4. Rev. HARDWICKE D. RAWNSLEY, Vicar of Crosthwaite, Keswick.

## I. OBJECT.

Annuities for the Clergy, payable at 65 years of age, on retirement from active duty.

## II. SOURCES OF INCOME.

(A) Subscriptions and entrance fees of Beneficiary Members.

(B) Voluntary contributions from (1) Individuals, (2) Churches.

## III. ASSISTANCE RENDERED.

Half annual premium paid by the Fund.

## IV. BENEFITS.

(A) A sum of 1,000*l.* payable at 65 years of age.

(B) An Annuity of 100*l.* from that age.

N.B.—1. In both cases premiums returnable without interest if the insured die before the age of 65.

2. Annuity may commence, or capital sum insured be received, at any age below 65, at a proportionate rate of annual premium.

3. Insurer not retiring till more than 65 years of age to be entitled to receive his annuity plus the capital value of the annuity accumulated between the time of attaining 65 years of age and his retirement.

4. At death of Insurer his Widow and Children to be entitled to all the benefits to which he himself would have been entitled had he lived.

See Report of Committee of Carlisle Diocesan Conference, 1880, on a Clergy Annuity Endowment Fund for the Northern Province.]

## 5. Rev. EDWIN R. WARD, Curate of Kilmington, near Axminster.

## I. OBJECTS.

Pensions of, say, 40*l.* per annum to aged Assistant Curates.

## II. SOURCES OF INCOME.

1. Annual subscription of 5*s.* from all Assistant Curates.

2. Collections and offertories in Churches.

## III. CONDITIONS.

Claimant must (A) be 60 years of age at least ;

(B) have done 20 years' service as a parochial Clergyman ;

(C) have been a subscriber to the Fund ;

(D) be elected by Administrators of the Fund.

[See *Clergyman's Magazine*, February 1882.]

## 6. Rev. T. WARREN TREVOR, Vicar of Penmon.

Aided Life Assurance, applicable to beneficed and unbeneficed. Known as the Bangor Scheme, now in operation.

## 7. Rev. G. W. DANKS, Vicar of Merton.

A Pension Fund by an *ad valorem* tax on all benefices, one-half of the tax returnable to the incumbent out of the offertory.

## 8. Rev. W. SADLER, Rector of Dembley.

Modification of Canon Blackley's proposals, by leaving age of ordination unchanged, but making the assurance compulsory.

## 9. Rev. J. LOWE, Vicar of Haltwhistle.

Proposes to create two funds. (1) *Superannuation Fund*, maintained by annual collections in every church, subscriptions, &c. (Out of this it is expected that pensions of 100*l.* might be granted to all curates and *poor* incumbents at 60*s.*) (2) *Annuity Fund*, raised by



annual payment of 7*l.* 10*s.* or 8*l.* a year from each clergyman, beginning at the age of 23. (This would afford a pension of 50*l.* at 60, independent of No. 1.)

10. Rev. H. GREENE, New Shildon, Durham.

A general Clergy Benefit Club, for Pensions to Clergy, their Widows and Orphans, contributions to be aided by church collections, clergy charities, and diocesan funds. (Several paragraphs of this proposal reappear in the paper on Clergy Pensions read by Dr. Barron at the Liverpool Church Conference.)

The number and variety of these details will show how entirely impossible it would have been, in justice to other parts of the subject, to deal at all exhaustively with these plans in the limits of the present article. It may suffice to say, pending some future opportunity of examining them, that, as a practical matter, the indisputably good objects aimed at by every one of them would, if not hopeless without, be greatly more hopeful with, the prospect, which we will by-and-by consider, of establishing some sort of general machinery for collecting and receiving the contributions, not merely of clergy likely to purchase pensions, but also of all other persons willing, as we believe very many are, to help them in their efforts.

It is well in the outset to remember that these schemes must be judged by their objects, which may be distinguished as 'Clergy Pensions,' 'Clergy Superannuation,' and 'Clergy Resignations.'

Most men desire and advocate the first of these, 'Clergy Pensions,' as in itself most desirable, though it is plain that a curate may have a pension without being superannuated, and that a beneficed man may have one without resigning his living.

On the other hand, unless a sufficient pension be provided to keep a curate without work, or an incumbent without a living, it is obvious that to require 'superannuation' of the one, or 'resignation' of the other, is a thing generally out of the question.

We will touch, first, the subject of 'Clergy Resignations,' having, in previous articles, dwelt more specially on the 'Pensions' aspect; for many advocates of a clergy pension fund would care comparatively little for its establishment but for the ulterior object of securing a provision sufficient to justify the removal from benefices of incompetent men. Their views deserve a great deal of serious attention, though, as we shall endeavour to show, generally based on misapprehensions; firstly, of the conditions on which livings are accepted and

held, and, secondly, of the advantage supposed to accrue necessarily to the Church itself, by insistence on some general system of removing old incumbents from duty, a course which, however desirable in occasional instances, might, as a general rule, do much more harm than good.

The so-called scandal of livings continuing to be held by aged men, the main part, or even the whole, of whose duties are discharged by deputy, is a favourite text for the enemies of our Church system to preach upon, and is often pressed with so effective a force as to induce even friends of our Church system to make very rash admissions or draw very hasty conclusions on the subject. For, in the first place, the scandal itself is a very rare one; in the second, the blame of the supposed scandal is ignorantly placed on the wrong shoulders; in the third, no legal remedy yet proposed is practical; and, in the fourth, any one of them, if practicable, would be unadvisable, or, in other words, would be no remedy, since it would be demonstrably worse than the disease.

The cases, we have ventured to say, are very rare of complete incapacity for duty of all sorts from age or infirmity. For we must bear in mind that the fact of one person, or a dozen in a parish, thinking their clergyman too old or too prosy, and feeling that a fresh one would be desirable, is no reason whatever for depriving such a man of his benefice. There are very few parishes indeed in which a few persons desirous of a change of parsons may not be found, and certainly where a living is in private patronage, with, so to speak, an heir apparent always in waiting, emphatic disapproval of anything that an old incumbent does or leaves undone would always find loud expression were the result certain to dispossess him. And yet, in nearly all such parishes, a poll of the people, could it be had, would be nearly certain to keep him in his place. Cases can be cited from the experience of many interested in matters of diocesan organization and administration, wherein very influential laymen have, *in the name of Church efficiency*, most vehemently pressed bishops to take extreme measures for compelling resignation against aged clergymen, when, on proper steps being taken by impartial episcopal nominees to ascertain the facts, it has appeared not only that the parishioners generally desired to keep their incumbent, but that the public-spirited opponent was, for personal, and not for Church, reasons, his bitter enemy. Indeed, when any real scandal occurs, present means are generally available to relieve a parish from a clerical incubus. But it

is trying  
scandal.

W  
desira  
instea  
blame  
unaut

T  
incum  
Churc  
to ass  
enem

A  
very  
cumb  
incum

B  
which  
condi  
his b  
agree  
activ  
ripen  
emph  
advan  
gene  
if he  
teria  
usefu

I  
right  
for t

R  
argu  
agita  
their  
such  
cons  
'Thi  
his a  
one

imp  
fulfi  
bent

is trying to prove too much to make old age or infirmity a scandal in itself.

We will, however, for argument sake, allow that it may be desirable for a parish to obtain the services of a vigorous instead of an aged and infirm priest. That the latter is blameworthy for retaining his post is, however, an absolutely unauthorized deduction from the premises.

That benefices should be the freehold of the individual incumbents has been, and is, the greatest safeguard of the Church of England; and every proposal in any way tending to assail that principle directly strengthens the hands of her enemies.

All livings are held under certain definite limitations. The very first of these is that the duties undertaken by the incumbent shall be done; and practically the execution of the incumbent's duty is a first charge upon the income.

But men are very apt to assume that the endowment, which is conditioned by the doing of one man's work, is to be conditioned by always supplying the work of that one man in his best days; a foolish position which no two people could agree in defining, some men's best days perhaps, for bodily activity, being from twenty-eight to forty; some, for mental ripeness, say from forty to sixty; and many, for great exemplary influence among their people, covering a far more advanced age than this. For we must remember that, generally, to the older part of his flock, an old man, especially if he have grown old among them, is of infinitely more ministerial value than a young one, and a staid, gentle friend more useful than the most vigorous and masterful 'new broom.'

In a word, parishioners generally have quite as good a right to dictate the removal of a juvenile as being too young for them, as of a grey-beard for being too old.

Passing from this consideration, and allowing still, for argument's sake, that the majority in a parish are justified in agitating for the removal of an incumbent, as inefficient for their spiritual needs; the next point to be considered is, that such persons place the blame, and, if they could, the sacrifice consequent on the blame, on the wrong shoulders. They say, 'This man, being old, fails to keep the covenant undertaken on his accepting the living and its income; he should resign both one and the other.'

The answer is that no such covenant was ever made or implied. The only covenant of the sort was implied, and is fulfilled, in the power the Bishop has of requiring the incumbent, when physically incapable, to pay some other qualified

man for doing the one man's (not two or ten men's) work essential to the post. The possible, occasional, and in the nature of things, passing inconvenience arising in one or another parish from this state of things, is after all a very small price indeed to pay for the security, given by our freehold system of incumbencies, that the Church at large shall retain its endowments for the advantage, not merely of beneficed men, but of every member of the Church of England.

If, then, the incumbent, either of his own accord, or by Episcopal requirement, carry out his whole contract, we are at an utter loss to see how he can, with any justice, long years after accepting a conditioned post, and observing its conditions, be called upon, by anyone, or by any class, as a matter of duty, decency, and religion, to vacate his post and surrender his emoluments; or, in fact, to submit at the end of his ministerial work to conditions he never heard of at the beginning.<sup>1</sup>

So much for the character of the infirm incumbent, very often, in our opinion, made to suffer unduly by those advocates of generosity by deputy, who have not considered both sides of this question.

We have said, however, that the sacrifice of resignation, not only of work but of means of existence, is placed on the wrong shoulders by simply requiring the old parson to resign. We shall be asked, 'On whose shoulders should it be placed?' The answer is very simple, namely, 'On the shoulders of those who desire it.' What else do they do, or have they ever done, for the sustentation of ministers whom they have never paid? The old rough proverb may be fairly quoted to them, 'Beggars must not be choosers.' If it be so spiritually injurious to them that their old clergyman should have his duty done, for the few years till he die, by a deputy paid by himself, surely the best thing they can do for their souls' sake is, not to require him to resign, but to make it worth his while; otherwise not much respect need be paid to the 'righteous' indignation of men who do not scruple to ask a man to give up his whole living in deference to their opinion, which they will not back themselves to the amount possibly of a penny in every pound of their own.

<sup>1</sup> It would be different, of course, if at any time the acceptance of a living were definitely conditioned by retirement at any stated age, or on falling short of any definite standard of efficiency; and it might be well to suggest in good time to clergy zealous for other men's resignations, to make some such conditions binding on themselves when accepting their next preferments.

But, it will be said, resignations without extraneous inducements may be effected, even now, on pensions drawn from the livings, and infirm men should therefore be required to apply for them and retire. Few who know anything of the practical working of the Incumbents' Resignation Act will fail to smile at this suggestion. That Act, indeed, allows an incumbent to apply for a pension, limited to a third of the income of his living, and chargeable on the benefice. But the consequences of his application are too uncertain in many cases, and too detrimental to the parish he leaves, in many others, to induce more than the rarest applications.

The sum fixed by the commission appointed to report on his application may be a very small one, instead of a third part of the living, and the applicant be obliged to retire on a nominal amount.

These provisions for incumbents are in glaring contrast to those made for the retirement of Bishops; for a Bishop may claim the third of his large income, where the broken-down incumbent of a small parish cannot be sure of getting even a fifth of his. The difference, we suppose, must be sought in the fact that an Episcopal vacancy, as placing a grand patronage in the hands of a Government, cannot come too often, while the vacancy of a poor living, weighted with a pension to a retired incumbent, is at the best a most difficult one to fill, and offers a most undesirable exercise of patronage.

It is, at all events, plainly manifest that whatever machinery exists in the Incumbents' Resignation Act for providing clergy pensions out of existing parochial endowments has done but little practical good and tends to a bad moral effect; the fact that a very few can avail, and have availed, themselves of it, not only too often making the pensioner's continued existence a sort of crime in the eyes of the successor who accepts his diminished income while longing for its increase, but also supplying a ground for endless reproach against the many elderly incumbents who prefer to die at their post to going forth in their old age to live among strangers.

Nor must one other point be left out of view; that, entirely apart from considerations of money or comfort, many an infirm incumbent may feel very deeply the duty of retaining his benefice till the last, as the only means in his power of keeping out from it a successor by whose teaching or whose character he really believes his parish likely to suffer detriment. In very many cases clergy know perfectly well the person likely to succeed them; and these successors presumptive may have views of doctrine and even of parochial

management with which the old man in possession may feel himself entirely unable to sympathize. However infirm, he may appoint during his lifetime a substitute willing to uphold the views he conscientiously holds himself, and may feel that resignation under such circumstances becomes an abandonment of true duty ; and, whatever his special views may be, who shall presume to pronounce him altogether wrong ? Very many good men, of every different party in the Church, have refused over and over again tempting and attractive offers of preferment, from fear of consciously abandoning to hands they cannot trust the shepherding of the flock once committed to their care ; and surely, in the face of such disinterestedness as refuses money advantage, the same line of conduct under contrary circumstances cannot fairly be assigned to mercenary motives only. Perhaps the most difficult point of all, and the one least thought of by hasty clamourers that all old clergy should execute the *Hari-Kari*, or *Happy Despatch*, is found in the fact that such a course would mean not merely comparative destitution to the clergyman himself, but in many cases absolute destitution to those he leaves behind at his death. Very few clergy indeed can think of making a purse for their relatives out of savings from their incomes ; but a great many, especially of those who most fully realize their Christian duty to 'provide for their own,' exercise a lifelong self-denial in order to keep up insurances for their families. Thus a lately deceased bishop seems to have insured his life at a cost of about a sixth part of his whole professional income. Suppose an infirm incumbent with an income of 600*l.* to act in the same proportion, his retirement on a third of his income, leaving him only 200*l.*, without a residence, to live upon, would involve the sacrifice or at least the surrender of his life policy, to keep up which cost him 100*l.* a year.

Yet another point, which it is really important in fairness to the unpopular side of this question to call attention to, is the fact that it is, for the most part, only the holders of livings of large income who are blamed for not resigning, and not the holders of livings of small income ; though it is perfectly plain that, if the interest of the parish concerned be the only point held in view, and not the interest of the (so to speak) heir apparent or incumbent expectant, the harm done to parishioners by inefficiency on the part of a man unable to pay a curate at all, or at all events a good curate, is vastly greater than that done to parishioners of a parish whose infirm incumbent can easily pay a good personal substitute, and whose poor folk would not miss the aids and alms which they



have been accustomed to expect and receive. On the whole, therefore, though unwilling to deny in some exceptional cases the duty of an infirm incumbent to resign his living, we believe the considerations we have thought right to array will satisfy many of our readers that there is very much to be said on the less considered side of this question; at least enough very materially to weaken the too hastily accepted argument in favour of any eventual compulsory resignation of benefices based on the broad and less considered assumption that no infirm man should continue to hold any benefice whatever.

It is very probable that in putting forward these views we shall be found to advocate a generally unpopular opinion. In reply we can only say that popular opinions are too often those arrived at at the smallest expenditure of study and thought, and that in matters of serious debate the popularity of an opinion ought to have no weight whatever in comparison with its reasonableness.

Holding, however, as we do, that no incumbent is bound by any sort of contract, implied or expressed, to resign his living at all, so long as he provides for the discharge of the duties attached to it, we will still go as far as anyone in urging the general desirability of stimulating and assisting the voluntary resignation of livings by physically incapable incumbents. In a word, to drive such a man out would be doing evil that good might come, while to draw him out would be doing good for the same object; and to all such cases we would urge the application of the time-honoured suggestion, *non vi, sed arte*. The first device essential to this end is to be able to offer him a retiring pension.

Notwithstanding the general consensus of opinion that, for one reason or another, the clergy, or at least the unbeneficed ones, should be provided with pensions, it is plain that the agitation of the question would not be so much more general at the present time than at any previous period, were there not some circumstances of advantage lately brought into view, which, if always indeed existent, were still unnoticed and unconsidered. If there were no more hopeful means than formerly of securing a benefit so desirable, there would be no public opinion or discussion of the subject; but the facts recently adduced of successful efforts made in other and less richly endowed Churches than our own to secure proper provision, as well as considerations brought forward, notably by Mr. Warren Trevor in the Bangor scheme, and by Mr. O'Donoghue in his notes upon clerical charities, indicating

means of aiding, at all events, the less well endowed members of the clerical profession in the purchase of such provision, by the utilization of charitable funds existent or future, joined to hopes we have ourselves ventured to encourage of a remarkable initial cheapening of the ordinary cost of deferred annuities in the special case of the unbeneficed clergy, have at last brought this important question well within sight, if not quite within the grasp, of practical parson's politics.

It seems to us, though we be still within the realms of theory, that in order to carry out any one of the different proposals put forward by their projectors in the direction of clergy pensions, one thing is of essential necessity. That is, that some organization should exist for receiving the contributions and paying the claims of the members; that the scales of contribution should be calculated on actual cost, and certified by skilled actuaries as reasonably sufficient to secure the contracts; that such an organization should be formed on bases so plainly sound as to justify trustees of charitable and diocesan funds in aiding deserving and necessitous contributors to secure the desired pensions through the organization, and thus to gain to their own contributions, as well as to the payments of the persons they assist, the advantages of such appreciations as the conditions of the contract can secure to the unbeneficed clergy. All this seems possible, but only in a society established specially *ad hoc*, and able to trace, record, and classify conditions of occupation as well as of age, a point which cannot be taken into consideration in calculations made for the general public.

Until we have some such society at hand, able to guarantee (so far as possible) the stability of such special contracts as we can indicate, the practical carrying out of none of these schemes can be successfully undertaken.

To understand the advantage of some such necessary organization, we shall be obliged to make a brief recapitulation of part of our former article (No. 31, April 1883), with certain important modifications caused by alterations in the condition of things since that article was written.

As tending to show that in an office able to make specially conditioned contracts, the cost of an annuity at sixty years of age for an unbeneficed clergyman would be only about a fourth part of the ordinary annuity charge, we adduce the following considerations.

Roughly speaking, there are two beneficed men at work in the Church for every one unbeneficed. This proportion is more likely to be altered in the direction of increasing the

188  
nun  
bein  
tha  
ber  
bein  
cum  
pen  
be  
ther  
ful  
(eac  
shov  
year  
ful a  
indu  
recei  
out  
recei  
of th  
bene  
ordin  
A  
num  
who  
at all  
and  
lains,  
vide  
from  
to be  
elimin  
that  
parish  
living  
fair w  
claim  
benefi  
during  
betwe  
W  
tribute  
1 TI  
annum  
annum.  
VOL

number of the beneficed than the unbeneficed, the tendency being, as far as possible, to create new incumbencies rather than to employ more curates;<sup>1</sup> the alleged diminution in number of candidates for ordination in proportion to population being assigned to the fact of the slowness of promotion to incumbencies, however small.

If all the clergy effected assurances at ordination for a pension at 60, *claimable only by those of them who should then be unbeneficed*, only one in three could draw the pension, therefore a third of the ordinary cost would suffice. A careful examination, however, made in two separate inductions (each of 1,000 names) from Crockford's *Clerical Directory*, shows another great appreciation. Out of 406 clergy of 60 years and upwards in those 2,000 (making very full and careful allowances for the number whom a pension of 100*l.* could induce to resign), it appears that only 87 could claim to receive the pension as unbeneficed. So that instead of one out of three, only three out of fourteen would be qualified to receive. Therefore (always roughly speaking), three-fourteenths of the ordinary pension cost would secure the benefit for unbeneficed clergy; or, to give a wide margin, a fourth of the ordinary cost would suffice.

Another point of great importance to consider is the number of the so-called 'unattached'; the ordained men who hardly ever labour or have laboured in pastoral work at all. Many of these are schoolmasters, fellows of colleges, and the like, whose occupations, like those of army chaplains, secretaries of societies, &c., either do or might provide retiring pensions for them. Their entire elimination from the calculation would still further cheapen the provision to be made by and for the parish clergy proper. Such elimination, however, is rendered a little difficult by the fact, that many a man who begins as a schoolmaster, ends as a parish clergyman, and many college fellows going out on livings, do the same thing. It seems to us, however, that a fair way of meeting this difficulty would be to add to the claimant's other qualifications of being 60 years old and unbeneficed, that of having been engaged in parochial work during 20 years out of the 36 or 37 which generally elapse between ordination and 60 years of age.

We turn next to the greater question, how is the contributor, whether new ordinee or older, to get the sum of

<sup>1</sup> The number of curates ordained increases at the rate of 11 per annum; that of new incumbencies created increases at the rate of 70 per annum.

money, necessary under all circumstances, to be laid out in the first purchase of the pension, however conditioned ?

In our previous article (to which we request the attention of all who study this subject, as the calculation here summarized is there worked out in detail), having shown the great cheapening caused by limiting receipt of pension to unbeneficed men, we proceeded to consider the ordinary cost of securing annuities.

We took for this purpose the Post Office Tables then in operation ; which gave the ordinary cost of such pension assurance (paid at 23 years of age) as 175*l.* 8*s.* 4*d.* A fourth part of this being 43*l.* 17*s.* 1*d.*, we confidently placed the amount necessary for a newly-ordained man to secure 100*l.* a year from the age of 60 while unbeneficed at 50*l.*

As several detailed schemes have been based on this estimate, it is important to point out a considerable necessary modification of this calculation since first put forth, at least in so far as it refers to Post Office Pensions. For since then (in 1884) the authorities have issued an entirely new set of tables which require a considerably higher rate of premium, the rate of interest at which the lump payments are calculated to accumulate being now only 2½ per cent., while the former scale was based on 3½.

Any person at all conversant with the great difference in accumulation resulting from a 3½ as compared with a 2½ investment, will see at once that a larger sum than our first estimate must be calculated. As a fact, the pensions purchasable in 1883 for 175*l.* cost in 1885 no less than 238*l.*

It will be noted, however, that in taking 50*l.* in round numbers, to represent the fourth part of 175*l.*, a very large margin was left over the exact proportion, which is 43*l.* 17*s.* 1*d.*; and it is very interesting to note that even with the great increase of prime cost of Post Office Pensions from 175*l.* to 238*l.*, on taking the more exact proportion, since worked out, of eventual unbeneficed claimants on the fund as being three to fourteen, the exact proportionate cost for each pension would even now be 51*l.*; for safety sake let us say 55*l.*, which would leave a margin of between 7 and 8 per cent. for contingencies.

Insurance societies can obtain for their funds far higher interest than the Post Office, not being obliged to invest in fluctuating securities so absurdly ill-adapted to insurance purposes (especially long insurances) as Consols ; a consideration illustrated by the fact that within the last five years the aggregate Life Insurance funds of all England were invested

at an average rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. It would seem very obvious that by proper management in a society established for the purpose, the clergy might secure their pensions at a much lower rate than in the Post Office. It will naturally, therefore, be asked, why the Post Office tables should, even for argument sake, be taken as in any sense typical for our calculation. Why, for instance, should not such an office as the great Clergy Mutual Society offer a scale? There are some interesting reasons. The first is this. The Post Office will contract with any male persons whatever and take its chance of their not exceeding the average longevity, and thus disturbing the calculations on which their pensions were granted. But a class society knows well that the clergy generally, as leading well-regulated and quiet lives, attain some years more than the average age of the whole population, and as longer payment of pensions for them than for other people would be expected, the initial cost would have to be proportionably greater too.

The following instructive tables are calculated on the actual experience of the Clergy Mutual Society, which, however, has long ceased to grant deferred annuities, for the obvious reason that the longer lived class of men with whom it has to deal, while able to purchase life assurances on better terms with it than elsewhere, on account of greater proved longevity, must for the very same reason pay it more for deferred annuities than organizations calculated, as the Post Office is, for all men of all classes, on a shorter average length of life.

Out of 1,000 persons alive at the age of 23 there will survive to the age of 60 according to—

The 'Carlisle table' . . . 611 persons

The Rev. John Hodgson's table . 675 "

The 'Clergy Mutual' experience 754 "

Comparison of the expectation of life according to the three above-mentioned tables :

Age.	Carlisle	Hodgson	Clergy Mutual
	Years.	Years.	Years.
23	39'3	42'4	45'3
30	34'3	36'9	39'4
40	27'6	29'1	31'0
50	21'1	21'6	22'8
60	14'3	14'9	15'4
70	9'2	9'5	9'3
80	5'5	5'7	4'9

Comparison of the cost of an annuity of 100*l.* payable half yearly, from the age of 60, according to the Clergy Mutual experience, assuming interest at 3 per cent. and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., with the actual cost of purchase from the Post Office :

Age at Purchase.	Clergy Mutual, 3 per cent.	Clergy Mutual, $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.	Post Office, 1884
	<i>£</i> <i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>£</i> <i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>£</i> <i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>
23	291 12 0	233 16 0	238 15 0
30	368 2 0	305 8 0	307 10 0
35	435 16 0	370 8 0	372 2 0
40	517 17 0	450 18 0	454 3 0
45	618 18 0	552 2 0	561 5 0

Seeing from this tabulation that ordinary pensions provided for clergy only, on the proper calculation of their longer life, would cost, at a  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. investment, a trifle less, and at a 3 per cent. investment a considerably larger sum than in the Post Office at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., we may, for the rest of this article, be content to assume the Post Office rate as the simplest calculable basis.

But still, it is asked, why should not the Clergy Mutual, or any great assurance society already established, make a scale, since, though its *general* pension cost may be higher, it could, after all, offer the *conditioned* pension for a rate very far below that of the Post Office ?

There is a reasonable, but not, we think, in every case, an insurmountable objection to carrying out this course. The objection is, in the first place, that the actuaries of an ordinary life office, the whole operations of which are based on experience, cannot, without any actual experience of conditioned pensions being tabulated before them, venture to certify any scale of this new sort as *absolutely secure* ; and the directors, without such clear certification from their actuaries, cannot venture to pledge the reserved funds of their societies, accumulated for other purposes, to make good these exceptional contracts, should any circumstances, now unforeseen, tend in the event (which cannot be known for thirty-seven years) to disturb the initial calculations. 'For instance,' they may very well say, 'long before thirty-seven years have expired we may find the Church disestablished and disendowed, and the definition of beneficed and unbeneficed may be entirely changed.'

It will be noticed that this is an altogether different thing from pronouncing any proposed rate *inadequate* to its declared



purpose; since for that opinion also they have no tabulated experience to guide them. It would seem, however, a very hard thing that there should be no way whatever, in a matter of such importance as that before us, of giving the clergy the benefit of the very large appreciations we have called attention to. It is perfectly obvious that unless every ordained man were and remained a curate at and after 60 years of age, and there were no beneficed men at all, the ordinary Post Office rate would be very much in excess of the sum needed to provide pensions conditioned by being unbeneficed. How can we utilize the evident appreciation?

There are various ways in which this may be done. An actuary who, without experience to guide his calculations, cannot give an established society an *absolute certification* of any scale of *absolute contracts*, may yet, and very reasonably, give a *conditional certification* of a scale of *conditional contracts*.

Under the Friendly Societies Acts, a Clergy Pensions Friendly Society might be established, whose rates an actuary could perfectly well certify as reliable *under certain named conditions*; leaving any change in the conditions to be dealt with as they may arise by the members of the society itself.

One difficulty in the way of a Society under the Friendly Societies Acts, however, might cause a little trouble, deferred annuities in such societies being limited to 50*l.* a year. It does not appear to us, however, that such a difficulty might not be got over by means of two Societies being established, in each of which a member could secure half the 100*l.* pension in view. There are great numbers of persons, members at the present time, not only of one, but of two, or of many different Friendly Societies.

And, indeed, the establishment, under high sanction, of something like this seems the best solution of the question, and will, we trust, prove to be the almost immediate outcome of the Committee on Clergy Pensions.

Some of our readers, however, would naturally take alarm at the consideration that a possible disestablishment of the Church of England might, as suggested, altering the status of the clergy, alter also the proportion of claimants. It seems, however, that any measure of that kind, whose direct effect was to deprive the clergy generally of a definite claim to pension, secured and paid for under existing circumstances, would be bound to secure to holders of the contracts those rights which such legislation jeopardized, or, in other words, that holders of contracts at the time of disendowment should

have those contracts guaranteed by the State which disendowed the Church.

Another way in which the matter might be accomplished, supposing the clergy generally satisfied that the Post Office ordinary rate of charge would give them as good terms as any society obliged to calculate on the higher cost required by clerical longevity, would be that each ordained man should purchase an absolute Post Office pension entitling himself at 60 years of age to an annuity of 25*l.*, and then transfer his policy to a society formed *ad hoc*, which should receive the pension when due, guaranteeing to the contractor, if unbeneficed at any time after 60 years of age, such annuity (not exceeding 100*l.*) as the sum of all the annuities divided among all the unbeneficed contractors above 60 years of age would produce.

In this case there could be no risk of losses, either from bad debts or malversation of funds. An annual contribution of, say, five shillings a year, or even less, from each contractor, to keep up a record, so to speak, of his existence and claims, would abundantly provide for costs of special management in the special societies. It is plain that this would at once give a national guarantee for the accumulation, security, and distribution of the fund.

But it may be said, suppose, in the event, the share to be received be less than 100*l.*, what will the insurer do? We answer, firstly, that this is very unlikely, the proportion of beneficed to unbeneficed men at 60 years old being more likely to increase than to diminish, but that, in the contrary case, the diminution would be so small and gradual as to affect the final reception of the pension in only a microscopical degree, it being remembered that the rate paid for would be in the proportion of one to four, while the 100*l.* pension could only be claimed by three in fourteen, thus allowing a margin for possible fluctuation of no less than  $8\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.

It will be noted that in all these calculations we have treated the case of a newly-ordained man only, but, of course, any scheme that only included these would be altogether too partial to be of general utility. Many of much higher age must also be provided for, but the strict principle must be laid down that, from whatever source the purchase-money be found, the cost proper for each separate year of life must be contributed.

It is important to observe that, with regard to many schemes proposed for general pension insurance, a payment always possible and generally easy for young men becomes

always difficult and generally impossible for old ones; a feature in the matter too often left out of view altogether, in urging the desirability of any general pension insurance by all men now in orders.

This will appear from another glance at our table of rates of cost for Post Office pensions of 100*l.* payable at 60 years of age, and purchasable at various ages.

These show that a man at 40, with probably a wife and family to support and provide for, by life assurance or otherwise, would have to pay for pension twice as much from his heavily-burdened income as a new ordinee with only personal needs to burden his resources.

It is evident, however, that though every man ordained has good reason to expect a living before 60 years of age (our previous tabulations showing that only 16 out of the 2,000 consecutive individuals considered had reached that age without being beneficed), there should be some sort of limit of age for purchasing the pensions. Probably the necessities of the calculation would be fully met by placing that limit at 40 years of age. Otherwise a larger proportion of the men least likely to obtain livings than of the general average would come upon the Pension Fund. This special consideration, however, would in the case of a society such as we have suggested under the Friendly Societies Acts, capable of self-adjustment to circumstances, only make a very fractional diminution in the average pension received, and that for a short time at the beginning of the scheme only, as the aids likely to accrue for securing the pensions would tend, in course of time, to make nearly all the clergy insure in early ministerial life.

It is very often said, however, and that by men who have experience of the circumstances of candidates for holy orders, that many of them would find any payment whatever for pensions absolutely impossible. Now, we may concede that in the case of a very microscopic percentage (by no means to be called 'many' in relation to the mass of ordinees) there may be some truth in this statement; but its truth can only apply, even in these rare cases, for a very limited space of time; and the argument of impossibility of contribution can, we think, only be upheld on the two assumptions, which will be found very difficult of proof, first, that a clergyman (bound, by his being so, to set a good social example) can be absolved from the social duty, which admittedly devolves upon every citizen, even if but a day labourer, of making provision for 'a rainy day'; and secondly, that that absolution can be reasonably

claimed on the ground of poverty by a young unencumbered man in full health and vigour, just beginning active life, and earning an average sum of fifty shillings a week! We may concede that some curates cannot *manage* to make both ends not only meet, but lap over enough to lay by a little from the start; but this matter might be *managed for them* by others, with perfect success. That is to say, by submitting their income for a short time to small deductions before it reach their pockets, the sum required for such an object as we all desire can be contributed with absolute ease. To put the thing in a nutshell, we are convinced that many of those for whom our theorists claim inability to contribute at the beginning of their professional life would find the difficulty solved by simple abstinence from the use of tobacco, or some other small indulgence, till their pension were secured.

'How,' we shall be asked, 'if the initial cost for a new ordinee be 51*l.*, can he be supposed to pay it?' Our answer would be of this sort: *If really too poor to pay it* in his first year, he might divide it over five, paying, of course, a fraction more as against loss of interest to the fund on the unpaid part, and, if unable to submit to a deduction, for this purpose, of say 10*l.* a year from his income, he might be aided by parochial, diocesan, and general Clergy Aid Funds during the five years. The 100*l.* a year or a benefice, which he would necessarily have at 60, would prevent his ever after that age being a burden, at all events for his own existence, on any of these organizations. Thus, suppose him only to contribute 2*l.* 10*s.* a year for five years, the parish he worked in might be expected to double it, the doubled sum might be offered to a Diocesan Clergy Aid Society for an augmentation of 2*l.* 10*s.*, and a Central Society of Clergy Charities might contribute the remaining portion. When he had worked till 60 years of age, no one would know who had paid his pension, and the Church would, at the lowest calculation, have one destitute stepchild the less.

There can be no sort of question that, once any really sound and advantageous scheme for securing either pensions or retiring allowances (these being not exactly correlative terms) for the clergy were put forth, not merely conjecturally as we have done, but by a reputable organization established for the special purpose, no scale of charge proposed and duly certified by skilled actuaries could be long regarded as prohibitive, even to the poorest and least well provided of the young clergy who seek ordination; because large contributions from Church charities (whose funds would benefit by giving

small sums in early, rather than large sums in late, clerical life), from offertory collections, and from diocesan organizations, would almost immediately flow in, to assist, not the society which might undertake the contracts, but the individual clergy who might be too poor at any age to purchase them wholly from their own resources.

There are still a number of important but undiscussed points connected with this subject. For instance, the making Pensions provision compulsory; its combination with any scheme of Widow and Orphan provisions; the methods of organizing and distributing to insurers sums in aid of pension cost; the wisdom or unwisdom of seeking legislative aid; the character, eleemosynary or otherwise, of aids to be solicited and received; the degree to which such aids can be regarded as secure enough for calculation; these and many more require examination, which the exigencies of space compel us for the present to defer. We shall hope, however, to resume the subject before long, and to be able to place before our readers the decisions arrived at by the Committee on Clergy Pensions.

---

#### SHORT NOTICES.

*Studies in the Book of Jonah. A Defence and an Exposition.* By R. A. REDFORD, M.A., LL.B., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1883.)

PART I. of the volume is introductory, and defends the authenticity of the Book of Jonah against the attacks of critics. The 'adverse theories canvassed' in the first chapter are those of Kuenen, that the book is a product of the opposition to the exclusive policy of Ezra towards foreign nations; and of Ewald, who regards the book as the work of some prophetic spirit in the sixth or fifth century, taking up an ancient legend, and shaping it with greater freedom for a didactic purpose. Reference is also made to an article by Mr. Cheyne, in the *Theological Review*, accepting Kuenen's theory, but no notice is taken of his later article on Jonah in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, which it would have been much more to the point to refer to, as it is found in a book readily accessible to the general reader.

'It is necessary,' Professor Redford says, 'sometimes to meet opponents on their own ground.' We might expect therefore to find these theories dealt with by arguments of a kind which their authors would admit. But when he comes to discuss Ewald, his main appeal is to authority, not to argument, and for the devout Christian, the

discussion of critical questions is regarded by Professor Redford as closed.

'To the Christian, who holds that *the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ* is above question, it will be an answer to all objections against the historical credibility of the Book of Jonah, that the use of it by the Saviour precludes the possibility of *His* regarding it in any other light than as an inspired work' (p. 7).

There is a dangerous confusion of thought here between historical credibility and inspiration. There are devout Christians who hold that there may be a dramatic element in the Old Testament, and that a book may be inspired, and may teach great lessons of Divine truth, without being historical in the sense of giving a narrative of facts which actually happened. The Book of Job is an obvious example.

Professor Redford deals far too easily with the question of the authorship of the book, and its peculiar character. It nowhere claims to have been written by Jonah. It is quite unlike any of the other Minor Prophets. How came it to be placed among them? Its affinities are with the narratives of the work of Elijah and Elisha, incorporated in the Books of Kings, to which it bears some striking resemblances in character, and even diction. 'It seems incredible' to Professor Redford 'that any other than the prophet should have written the book exactly as we now possess it' (p. 202), but the hypothesis that it was based on an ancient tradition, and brought into its present form long after the lifetime of Jonah, deserves a much more respectful hearing than he is disposed to give it.

Part II. contains a literal rendering, and an 'exegetical study of the words.' The translation calls for little remark, though we are puzzled to know how, in defiance of the parallelism and the accents, to say nothing of common sense, the author could have allowed such a translation to appear as this:

'And he said, I called in my distress upon Jehovah,

'And He answered me from the belly of Sheol;

'I cried, and Thou didst hear my voice' (ii. 2).

The only possible rendering is:

'I called out of my distress unto Jehovah, and He answered me:

'Out of the belly of Sheol I cried; Thou didst hear my voice.'

The Commentary presents few fresh features. It is largely taken from that of Prebendary Huxtable, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, often with but little variation or modification. But a writer who undertakes to comment on the Old Testament ought at least to be able to transcribe Hebrew correctly. Yet in the note on ch. iii. 4 we find a form which has no existence in Hebrew (נִקְחָה), and that it is not a mere error of the press is evident, for the transliteration given (*nipácheh*) reproduces the blunder. (See also הָבֵלִי for הָבֵלִי, p. 112; לֵלִי for לֵלִי, p. 185.)

Part III. contains an 'historical and practical exposition of the main features of the book.'



We are far from asserting that the reader will not derive any profit from a perusal of this volume; but we feel constrained to say most plainly that it by no means corresponds to our ideal of what such a book should be. The title 'Studies' leads us to expect a work upon which considerable labour has been expended; which, if not original in the sense of propounding startling theories—a kind of originality which we have no wish to see becoming general in this country—is at least original in a very true sense, because its author has really mastered what has been written on the subject, and passing it through the crucible of his own mind, has recast it into a form more attractive or more available, and left the stamp of his own mind upon it. Professor Redford proposes to treat other prophets on a similar plan. We hope he will do so, for there is certainly need of books on the Old Testament; but if he desires to make any substantial advance on already existing books, it must be by a much more careful and laborious treatment. We believe that if he will set himself a higher standard, he is capable of producing far more satisfactory and useful work than this.

*The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.* The Book of Job, with Notes, Introduction, and Appendix. By the Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1884.)

THIS is an admirable book. It is a real contribution, not to Old Testament exegesis only, but to the exposition of Old Testament theology. Twenty-two years ago Professor Davidson published the first part of a Commentary on Job, which Professor Delitzsch, in his own Commentary, describes as striving to unite, not unsuccessfully, the enthusiasm for the poetical grandeur of the book characteristic of Umbreit, Ewald's vivid perception of the tragical, and Hirzel's sound tact and good arrangement. The work was never completed, but the present volume is evidence of the careful and patient way in which the author's studies have been carried on.

The Introduction deals with—(i) the Contents of the Book; (ii) the Nature of the Composition; (iii) the Idea and Purpose of the Book; (iv) the Integrity of the Book; (v) the Age and Authorship of Job. Under the second head are discussed the questions—(1) whether the Book is historical, or a pure creation of the mind of the writer; (2) whether it may be called a drama, or assigned to any other recognized class of writing. After a brief review of various opinions Dr. Davidson concludes thus:—

'The prevailing view, which is no doubt just, is that it reposes on a historical tradition, which the author has used and embellished, and made the vehicle for conveying the moral instruction which it was his object to teach' (p. xvii).

His answer to the second question is that the Book of Job

'can hardly be named a drama, though it may justly be called dramatic.' . . . 'It contains many elements of the drama, such as dialogue, and a plot with an entanglement, development, and solution. The action,

however, is internal and mental, and the successive scenes are representations of a great soul struggling with the mysteries of its fate, rather than trying external situations' (p. xxi).

The chapter on the idea and purpose of the Book is excellent. It shows how it not only aims at the negative result of traversing the popular doctrine that sin and suffering are in all cases connected, but offers a new view of suffering, and purposes to widen men's views of God's providence. And, further still, it has a national application. It is a kind of apologue designed to inspire new conduct, new faith, new hopes. In Job Israel may see itself, and from the sight take courage and forecast its own history.

While admitting that a good many considerations suggest the Solomonic age as a probable date for the Book of Job, Professor Davidson, after careful discussion, decides that it cannot have been written earlier than the seventh century.

'The most weighty arguments for assigning the book to an age not earlier than the seventh century are the two facts, closely related together, first, that questions of providence have entered upon a new phase: its laws are no longer calmly expounded but subjected to doubt; from being principles securely acquiesced in they have become problems painfully agitated; and secondly, that a condition of great disorder and misery forms the background of the poem. These two circumstances naturally go together, and they both point to the same comparatively late period' (p. lxiii).

He concludes that, 'upon the whole, probabilities point to the age of the captivity of Judah as that to which the Book belongs.'

The Commentary is as thorough as the Introduction. It will seldom be consulted in vain for the explanation of a difficult passage. It is rich in valuable thought suggested by the discussions of the Book. We may quote as an example the general reflections which close the Commentary on chap. xi. :—

'The problems that trouble us are not new. These ancient disputants graze at least the edges of most of them. Under Zophar's speech lies the question, If the affirmations of a man's conscience or of his consciousness be contradicted by the affirmations of God, what does it become a man to do? Job's conscience declared that he had not been guilty of sins, while God by his afflictions was clearly intimating that he had. It may be safely concluded that a real contradiction of this kind will never occur. Both Zophar and Job were under a false impression when they supposed that God by His afflictions was affirming his guilt. They put a wrong meaning on his afflictions. Zophar, however, thought that a man must bow to God. But as Job's consciousness spoke to a fact, which was to him indubitable, he felt that he was unable to submit. The history of Job teaches us that the wise course in such circumstances is to raise the prior question, Is this supposed affirmation of God really His affirmation? It may be that we are putting a wrong construction on His words or providence. And as such supposed contradictions will not usually be, as in Job's case, in regard to simple facts, but to moral judgments and the like, there is much room always to raise the prior question also on the other side, Is this affirmation of conscience, which seems opposed to the intimations of God, a true affirmation of conscience—the

affirmation of an enlightened, universal conscience? As none of us, unfortunately, is in possession of this universal conscience of mankind, but only of our own particular one, which must, however, be our guide, perplexities may occasionally arise in our actual religious experience' (p. 86).

'Reverent minds have always found difficulty in accommodating themselves to the religious boldness of the Book of Job.' And some reverent minds may think Professor Davidson over-bold in some of his interpretations. But the book is one which no student of the Book of Job—and who can call himself a student of the Old Testament who is not a student of this most marvellous Book?—can afford to neglect. Job cannot be much studied in schools, but it ought to be more studied in colleges, and still more by maturer students. This book should give an impulse to its study. Its clear reasonings, its judicial fairness, its scholarly and philosophic grasp, its depth of insight, cannot fail to make it welcome to every student of the Old Testament.

*The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.* Hosea, with Notes and Introduction. By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1884.)

THERE is a freshness and brightness about Dr. Cheyne's writing which gives it a peculiar charm, and the commentary on Hosea is no exception. To some readers he will seem over-bold in criticism of the text, and desertion of traditional ideas for comparatively novel views. For example, he would solve the difficulty of the connexion between vv. 9 and 10 of chap. i. and between vv. 1 and 2 of chap. ii. by placing i. 10–ii. 1 at the end of chap. ii. The transposition certainly cuts the knot of an exceedingly obscure passage, and may be the true explanation; but expedients of this kind are hazardous. The exposition of the 'five leading ideas of the prophecy' in chap. iv. of the Introduction is excellent. They are defined to be (a) immorality of the Northern Kingdom; (b) sinfulness of the idolatrous Jehovah-worship, and of the confusion of Jehovah and Baal; (c) sinfulness of Israel's foreign policy; (d) sinfulness of the separate kingdom of Israel; (e) the conception of love as the bond between Jehovah and Israel, and between the individual Israelites. In regard to this last great principle—'the highest and deepest, and therefore the most fundamental in the book'—Hosea 'marks a fresh stage in the slow progress of revelation.' For him it was most true that 'knowledge by suffering entereth.' The bitter experience of faithful love repaid by unnatural infidelity had burnt into his inmost soul an image of Israel's unfaithfulness to Jehovah which he expresses with a tender force and passionate yearning which are quite unique.

Hosea is not a book likely to be much read in schools, and Dr. Cheyne has done wisely to adapt his notes to the wants of more advanced students. We hope no one will be misled by the title of the series into neglecting this book, which will be valuable even to those who have already given close attention to this most obscure of prophets.

*Notes and Dissertations upon the Prophecy of Hosea.* By JOHN SHARPE, Rector of Elmley Lovett, late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: Deighton, 1884.)

MR. SHARPE'S book is intended for Hebrew students, but those who are reading Hosea for the first time will not find here quite all the help they want for the satisfactory understanding of the prophet's language; e.g., in the note to i. 6 it is not explained why the word is 'præter,' not 'participle;' nor do the dissertations prefixed to the volume form a sufficient introduction to the study of the prophet. The questions of the date and circumstances of the time, for example, are very briefly treated in Dissertation I., where the common dates are given without any hint that they are most probably untrustworthy. This, however, is merely a negative criticism, and only amounts to saying that Mr. Sharpe's plan is different from what we anticipated.

The dissertations (in addition to the one already referred to on the life and writings of Hosea) discuss (ii.) the Marriage with Gomer, an Historical Fact; (iii.) the Religion of Ephraim; (iv.) the Ten Tribes and the Half Tribe of Manasseh; (v.) Hosea and the Canon; (vi.) the Hebrew Idea of Faith. Of these the third and fifth are the most elaborate and important. In the third, by an exhaustive examination of passages from the prophets and historical books, Mr. Sharpe endeavours to prove that the calf-worship of the northern kingdom was not intended to be the worship of Jehovah. In his anxiety to refute the extreme views of Kuenen and others as to the toleration of calf-worship by Elijah and Elisha, he tries to prove too much, and is forced to adopt unnatural explanations of a number of passages which clearly show that the worship of Israel, though idolatrous and corrupted by a large infusion of heathenish elements, was intended to be the worship of Jehovah.

The fifth dissertation investigates the difficult question whether Hosea was acquainted with the Pentateuch and early historical books. The conclusion reached is that 'Hosea was familiar with our Pentateuch and early history, or with the written documents *from which our books were compiled*.' We have italicized the last words because, from such a conservative critic as Mr. Sharpe, the admission is remarkable. We are afraid, however, that he will not convince those who, on other grounds, doubt the early date of the books in question, though the facts are by no means all on one side.

Mr. Sharpe is a strong defender of the Masoretic text and of traditional interpretations, even in such passages as v. 11 and xi. 9, which most critics abandon as desperate.

The book is, unfortunately, not written in an attractive style, and suffers from the comparison which it is almost unavoidable to draw between it and Dr. Cheyne's more brilliant work; but the book is by no means one to be neglected by the student; and even those who cannot follow Mr. Sharpe in all his conclusions will yet find much in it which deserves their careful consideration.

*An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers.* By various Writers. Edited by CHARLES JOHN ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Vols. IV. and V. (London: Cassell and Company, 1884.)

THE very short intervals suffered to elapse between the publication of the several volumes of this Commentary have made us somewhat tardy in our notice of the later ones, as both of those now before us bear the date of 1884. We have carefully examined them throughout, and cannot but confess that the feelings of disappointment with which we laid down the first volume have not been removed by a perusal of the notes on the later books. The work is of course unequal. Some of it is good, decidedly good, but a large part is after all of a very ordinary character, and contrasts unfavourably with that contained in the little volumes issued from time to time by the Cambridge Press, a series which appeals to much the same class of readers, and in which an unusually high level of excellence has hitherto been maintained.

The fourth volume of Bishop Ellicott's Commentary contains the poetical books and Isaiah. Of these Job has been entrusted to Professor Stanley Leathes, with anything but happy results. The notes are very meagre, and cannot be said to be in any way successful in throwing light on this very difficult book; nor does the introduction tend to raise our estimate of the Professor's qualifications for the work which he has undertaken. After all that has been written during the last few years it is rather too late in the day for such a note as the following:—

'It must be borne in mind that we have every reason to believe that the several books of the Bible were the work of well-known actors in the Bible history, and not of casual and insignificant authors. In the New Testament it is so with the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it is probably so in every case in the Old Testament. It is not likely that there is in the Old Testament the work of any man who is not known to us from the history, whether in the case of Chronicles, Judges, Ruth, or Job. But if this is so, as seems most probable on every ground, and if we are right in maintaining the antiquity of Job, then there is no one so likely to have written it as Moses. Indeed, with the exception of Job himself, whose virtual authority for the book must be presupposed in any case, if it is a true history, there is no one else who can have written it.

The position which Mr. Stanley Leathes thus sets himself to defend is one which we had fancied was abandoned by critics of every school, and we cannot think that the commentary before us will do much to restore it to favour.

The notes on the Psalms are from the pen of the Rev. A. S. Aglen, who has also contributed those on the Song of Solomon. They are full, and often interesting and original; but the writer is too much inclined to dash off in search of supposed parallels to the thought or expression in the poetry of other languages. This tendency is especially manifest in the notes on the Song of Solomon. One does not want quotations from the love language of Ben Jonson, or Keats,

or Shelley, scattered broadcast over the page, and it is really too bad to be referred to the *Arabian Nights* for some detail connected with anointing in such a psalm as the 45th! Such straining after parallels often offends against good taste, and is conducive neither to reverence nor to a real intelligent study of the text. Again, we cannot but regret that Mr. Aglen has committed himself so strongly to what we must call the modern craze for 'Maccabean psalms.' Granting that it is not impossible that some psalms may belong to this age, yet when there is such a definite reference to the existence of a *king* of the Davidic line as there is in Psalm lxxxix. 18, why, in the name of all that is reasonable, is the date to be brought down to the second century before Christ? There is, by the way, an admission on p. 194 of which the defenders of the early date of the Psalms would do well to take note. In replying to an objection drawn against the Maccabean date of Psalm lxxiv. from the strength of the expressions used, which seem exaggerated if applied to the mischief wrought by the Syrians, Mr. Aglen tells us that 'we must allow at such a crisis a little license to patriotism and poetry.' Precisely so: but why, then, is such license to be denied to all earlier writers? Our great complaint of so much of the purely negative criticism of the present day is its utter incapacity to understand the need of a liberal interpretation of the terms used by poets and prophets. It takes everything *au pied de la lettre*, and expects the language of psalmists and seers to be measured with mathematical exactness. Only grant to David and the other psalmists just this 'license' which Mr. Aglen claims for his Maccabean friends, and half the arguments against the value of the titles to the Psalms will fall to the ground at once, and the Maccabean hypothesis will become needless.

The books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes will not detain us long. They are both entrusted to competent scholars, and the names of the Rev. J. W. Nutt and the Rev. G. Salmon supply a sufficient guarantee of the scholarly character of the notes.

Passing now from the poetical to the prophetic books, we find that Isaiah and Jeremiah together with the Lamentations are annotated by the Dean of Wells. Dr. Plumptre's style is so well known that it is almost superfluous to say that this part of the Commentary is marked by the same originality and ingenuity as his other works. The notes are excellent, and our only regret is that the limits assigned to the writer are so very narrow as sometimes to prevent him from doing full justice to his subject. They are, of course, thoroughly up to date, and (so far as space permits) full use is made of the latest Assyrian and Babylonian discoveries. With regard to the authorship of chapters xl.-lxvi., after a careful review of the arguments on both sides the Dean finally arrives at the conclusion that they are 'substantially the work of Isaiah.' On the similar question so often raised in connexion with the later chapters of Zechariah Mr. Lowe is still more decided in his adherence to the conservative opinion. In neither case is the problem entirely free from perplexity, but still we are glad to find that the traditional view has the support of scholars so free from bias and yet so well qualified to form an opinion.



The Commentary on Ezekiel by an American divine, the Rev. F. Gardiner, is businesslike and sensible, but presents no features which call for special remark. That on Daniel has suffered from over-condensation. Mr. Deane's competence is undoubted, but the very narrow limits within which he has had to work have seriously diminished the value of his labours, and we can scarcely consider this part of the commentary a success. The 'Minor Prophets' are also disappointing. None of the writers rise to a really high level, nor is there much that is novel in their exposition. Mr. Lowe's work on Zechariah is perhaps the best, and contains a certain amount of Rabbinical learning, which will probably be new to most readers. The best part of the notes on the minor prophets, as is not unnatural, is drawn from Dr. Pusey's great work; and we cannot conclude without a protest against the covert sneer, which good taste ought to have led Mr. Lowe to suppress, but which, nevertheless, is evidently implied in the following note on Malachi i. 11:—

'Dr. Pusey's foot note on this passage is well worth reading, as indeed his *foot notes* usually are.'

The italics, of course, are due not to us, but to Mr. Lowe; and their import will be obvious to the reader.

*The Pulpit Commentary. 1 Chronicles. Exposition and Homiletics.*  
By the Rev. Professor P. C. BARKER, M.A. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1884.)

HERE is another volume, the seventeenth, we believe, of this rapidly growing work. It consists, like previous volumes, of a critical introduction; a running commentary upon the text, verse by verse; and a series of homilies, founded more or less directly upon the text. The first of these makes no claim to original investigation, but is a painstaking and careful compilation of all the facts that can be said to be really ascertained respecting the date, author, and apparent purpose of the Books of Chronicles. Our knowledge, unfortunately, is not very precise upon these points. Who the author was of the triple work now known as 1 and 2 Chronicles and Ezra, whether it was that great lawgiver and second Moses, 'Ezra the scribe,' as their present editor is inclined upon the whole to conclude, must be considered as being still *sub judice*. All the probabilities of the case, however, point to such a conclusion. But even so it is to be borne in mind that, from the peculiar nature of the contents of the Chronicles, Ezra's relation to that work was more that of a compiler and editor of existing materials than that of an author strictly so called. Not less than *ten* sources of information are expressly referred to in the book itself, including memoirs or 'acts' by the prophets Nathan, Samuel, and Gad; while in one case the *Midrash* (*Interpretation, Story, or Commentary*, A. V. xiii. 22) of Iddo the seer, in another his 'visions' (2 Chronicles ix. 29), are referred to as authorities. Doubtless the compiler, whoever he may have been, had these before him as he wrote or transcribed. The question of the genealogies, of which so much of the text of these books consists, is of the same kind, and hardly less clear; though it strikes us that the present editor's treatment is not

VOL. XX.—NO. XXXIX.

Q

as complete as might be wished, owing to his not sufficiently including 2 Chronicles in his view. It is not difficult to understand that there must have been accurate tables of genealogy continuously made and preserved throughout all the tribes, because the inheritance and devolution of all the lands in the country depended upon these. It may be more doubtful whether there was anything in the nature of a public 'register' at Jerusalem embodying this information; but if not, the *lacuna* would be sure to be filled up by the compilations of many persons more or less connected with the learned and dignified body of officials of which the Temple of Jerusalem was the centre. It is the more clear that such was the case, since we find one such compilation, 'the book . . . of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies,' expressly referred to in 2 Chronicles xii. 15.

Then came the Babylonish captivity; and there must have been a great scattering, probably a great destruction, of documents of this kind; though many or most of such would be carried away by heads of families with them in their exile, and perhaps brought back after the seventy years. It was apparently in order to remedy the inconveniences caused by the loss of documents in this way that the compilation now known as the Books of Chronicles was undertaken; and we arrive in this manner at an approximate date for their composition.

The weak point of this volume, to our mind, lies in that which is at the same time its largest element, the 'Homilies.' And these we cannot away with. There are better and worse among them, but the generality are jejune and commonplace in the extreme. It is a pity to fill up the volume with sermons of no higher a stamp than these.

*The Messages of the Books; being Discourses and Notes on the Books of the New Testament.* By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1884.)

THIS appears to us a useful kind of book, with a preface by no means useful. Part of this latter is mere surplusage, as when Dr. Farrar enlarges on what nobody thinks of denying, the great advantage of the systematic study of Scripture; part rests on the implied but very doubtful postulate that the only sense of Scripture valuable or authoritative in the Church is that 'intended by the original writers.' It would take us too long to controvert this dictum on the present occasion. But it is our impression that it would be found, 1st, that this, the original and literal sense, is frequently the least fruitful and important of all, though doubtless all have their value; and 2nd, that Scripture itself affords frequent examples of a freer and more spiritual—that is, more typical—understanding of other parts of Scripture, so much so that this method may rightly be called the habitual method in which the sacred writers themselves compare Scripture with Scripture; and that from them it was handed on to the Fathers of the Christian Church. S. Paul's quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures may be referred to as instances of this. We fear, however, that it is certain that this spiritual method is liable to abuse, and that

fra  
fr  
gu  
ge  
mu  
err  
abo  
wh  
is t  
rai  
  
so l  
Far  
her  
Scri  
sym  
We  
his  
hun  
Rom  
such  
deed  
to A  
a gre  
marl  
the C  
curio  
as a  
bound  
with  
schoo  
that  
Gene  
as, fo  
this v  
allow  
and m  
  
The  
M  
a  
  
In an  
the re  
has co  
ful ill  
Schille  
the Je  
the en  
mitted  
contain

fragments of the Bible have been, as Archdeacon Farrar observes, frequently 'misquoted and misapplied.' There is, however, no safeguard against such a tendency supplied by his own method, or by any general method, so far as we can discern. Each instance of inference must be tried on its own merits, and it is inevitable, we suppose, that errors in inference there should be, if people are to think and write about such matters at all. Let them be pointed out, by all means, when and as they occur, but it hardly appears that an entire theology is therefore to be charged with error, in order to create a place and a *raison d'être* for Dr. Farrar's new book.

We cannot, however, but welcome any introduction to Scripture so long as it be in any degree worthy of the subject, and though Dr. Farrar's well-known liberal theological views find a frequent place here, yet we find also his characteristic merits as an expositor of Scripture—elegant scholarship, a brilliant style, and great power of sympathy with the writers and the ages with whom he has to do. We know nothing of the kind more brilliant or more masterly than his account on pp. 343–345 of the 'inexcusable butchery' of the four hundred slaves of the murdered Pedanius, or of S. Paul in the Roman dungeon and expectant of death upon pp. 394, 395. In such episodes Dr. Farrar shows at his very best. We cannot, indeed, agree with him in his attribution of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Apollos, which appears to us a gratuitous assumption, and to leave a great portion of the facts unaccounted for, as, for instance, the remarkable similarity between the acknowledged writings of S. Paul, the Gospel of S. Luke and the Acts, and thirdly this Epistle. The curious reader will find them catalogued by Winer and Delitzsch, as also by Dr. Kay in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' We feel bound to retort upon him the phrase of 'an attenuated exegesis' with which he pelts theologians and commentators of the Patristic school: for what exegesis can possibly be more 'attenuated' than that which has nothing to offer beyond the simple literal sense? Generally throughout the volume he mentions patristic expositions, as, for example, that of 1 Tim. ii. 15, only to disparage them; but to this we are well accustomed in his books. If the reader can make allowance for such adherent prejudice, there is much to be gained from, and much to be enjoyed in, the perusal of this volume.

*The Mishna as illustrating the Gospels.* By W. H. BENNETT, B.A., M.A., London; Tyrwhitt Scholar. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1884.)

IN an interesting essay, which he has published 'in accordance with the requirements of Mrs. Ann Fry's Hebrew Scholarship,' the author has collected in a compendious and readable form a number of useful illustrations of the Gospels. The Mishna, described by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy as 'the fundamental document of the oral law of the Jews,' was not compiled and arranged in its present form until the end of the second century A.D., and in all probability not committed to writing until much later. But the traditions which it contains date from a much earlier period, and it may be regarded as

one of the most valuable sources to which we can refer for illustrations of Jewish life and thought at the time of our Lord's ministry and the spread of Christianity.

The Mishna was preserved for centuries by oral tradition, and Mr. Bennett draws attention to the support which this fact gives to the 'oral theory' of the origin of the synoptic Gospels. In addition to a chapter on the Mishna as illustrating the Gospels generally, he has collected a number of special illustrations under the heads of 'The Pharisees,' 'The Sabbath,' 'The Status of Women,' 'Ethics and Doctrine,' 'Vows,' 'The Poor,' and has appended chapters on the 'Relation of the Mishna and the Gospels to the Old Testament,' and the 'Subsequent History of the Mishna and the Gospels.'

Mr. Bennett depends on translations, and does not profess to have studied the Mishna in the original; but his essay well deserved publication, and may be read with advantage by students of the New Testament who wish to examine some of the side-lights which can be thrown upon it, collected into one focus instead of scattered up and down the ordinary commentaries and books of reference.

*Footprints of the Son of Man, as traced by S. Mark.* By HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Canon of Ely, and Principal of the Theological College, &c. With an Introduction by the LORD BISHOP OF ELY. 2 vols. (London: Rivingtons, 1885.)

DR. LUCKOCK'S published studies on liturgical subjects will have prepared Churchmen to welcome this more recent work connected with Holy Scripture, by which the author has laid us under fresh obligations. His book is designed, according to the title-page, 'for private study, family reading, and instructions in church.' For one or all of these three purposes we heartily recommend it. For private use the book may be compared with Mr. Peter Young's 'Daily Readings for a Year' (which we have long desired might be republished in a less expensive and more convenient form), though the two works differ one from another in that the 'Daily Readings' are based upon a harmony of the Four Gospels, while in the 'Footprints' the story of S. Mark alone is followed, and in that Mr. Young gives more of personal application while Dr. Luckock leans rather to exegesis. But the books are alike in their sober, reverent treatment of our Lord's words and works, a refreshing contrast to the harsh criticism, or sensational word-painting, which shock the devout reader in some modern Lives of Christ. The chief purpose, however, of Dr. Luckock's lectures, for which the Bishop of Ely desired their publication, is to give an example of didactic and expository instruction in the congregation as distinct from hortatory sermons, and to further the use of the former kind of addresses. On this subject Bishop Woodford's weighty words (in his Introduction) demand attention, the more so as coming from one who is at once himself a preacher of the first rank and a watchful observer of the times:

'There is probably,' the Bishop says, 'no branch of the Catholic Church in which more sermons are preached than in the Anglican Communion; there is perhaps also no branch of it in which there is less didactic exposition of the sacred text; less explanatory teaching as to

the Constitution and Ordinances of the Church. The result is that the majority of ordinary Church people, when called upon to defend their own system, know less about it than the members of any other religious body. The sermons preached to our congregations are almost exclusively hortatory. It may be questioned whether the constant listening to addresses whose sole object is to awaken the conscience and move the affections does not tend in some degree to defeat its own object. At any rate this kind of preaching requires, I am persuaded, to be supplemented by careful and regular expository teaching.<sup>1</sup>

We will venture to add that the most eloquent and touching hortatory appeals often fail of their effect because pains are not taken to inculcate the motives and grounds on which these appeals must be based if they are to have any real and abiding power. 'He that cometh to God must first believe that He is' is an apostolic maxim which (in its wider applications as well as in its most literal sense) preachers in these days especially ought to remember, but which they seem too often to forget. We are not advocating frequent controversy in the pulpit, but such an element of explanation and instruction as would clear away difficulties that may be felt and fortify the hearers against both the cavils of sceptical critics and the misinterpretations of heretics. The latter, we are convinced, are often adopted by well-meaning persons because they are the first attempt at interpretation of mysteries connected with the Divine Being or dealings that has been offered to them.

The Bishop recommends, as a substitute for a week-day discourse, or even for one of the Sunday sermons, the systematic reading of some Book of Holy Scripture with a brief *explanatory* comment, after the model of these lectures on S. Mark's Gospel, which were delivered on Wednesdays and Fridays in S. Catherine's Chapel of Ely Cathedral.

Dr. Luckock's method is to give a continuous exposition of S. Mark's Gospel, paragraph by paragraph, in eighty portions. Seeking, as the title of his book suggests, to follow closely our Lord's Footprints in the different scenes of His ministry, he generally notices in the first place any question of harmony or topography that may occur, and from this often secures a vivid presentation of the scene. He then briefly comments on the passage by way of explanation and instruction.

As illustrating the value of the book for public use, we may refer to three consecutive lectures on part of S. Mark x. In the first (xlv.), on 'The Law of Divorce,' one cannot fail to notice the same fairness and care not to overstate his case which was so conspicuous in Dr. Luckock's 'After Death,' and especially in his dealing with the practical expressions of our belief in the Communion of Saints. The lecture is a plain and valuable summary of scriptural and ecclesiastical teaching concerning marriage and divorce, such as could be read, and certainly not without profit, to any congregation.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We could wish, to make the statement more complete, and to avoid possible misunderstanding, that in the note on Deut. xxiv. 1, the author had pointed to the significance of the word *πορνεια*, in S. Matt. xix. 9, as probably referring to ante-nuptial unchastity which rendered invalid the marriage contract. It is this interpretation which governed the whole Western law of divorce, both Roman and Anglican.

The next lecture (xlv.), on 'The Authority for Infant Baptism,' is admirably adapted for reading in church, especially at the time of ministration of baptism to infants. It gives the teaching that is needed, not only in places where the Anabaptist sect may be influential, but by our average country-town congregations.

The third (xlvii.), on 'The Rich Young Ruler,' comments on a passage, S. Mark x. 17-31, in which not less than four difficulties or questions would, we will be bold to say, present themselves to the mind of an intelligent listener as he heard the verses read in the lesson. And each is satisfactorily explained by Dr. Luckock:—Our Lord's question, 'Why callest thou Me good? there is none good but One, that is God' (than which no text is more commonly urged in popular argument by Unitarians); the disposition and character of the young man whom Jesus 'loved,' yet who could not bring himself (then, at any rate) to part with everything at the Master's word; the proverbial saying of the camel passing through the needle's eye, by which our Lord enforced His warning, 'How hardly [with what difficulty] shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of Heaven;' and, lastly, the promise of a hundredfold recompense now in this time to those who, for His sake and the Gospel's, leave home and family and possessions: concerning which we would quote Dr. Luckock's comment as giving a true, though of course not exhaustive, explanation:

'Jesus, knowing out of the depths of His own experience how great is the joy of self-sacrifice, how transcendently superior to everything else, assures them that they will have the reward both here and hereafter. Here in a vastly intensified appreciation of earthly enjoyments, finding new homes and new friends wherever they go, and seeing new beauties in the commonest things.'

As Bishop Woodford says, in commending the lectures to the clergy of his diocese for use in their churches, 'In some they may be read exactly as they are printed; in others they may be expanded or modified according to the character of the congregation.' And here we would suggest one word of caution to the younger clergy. While we regard the lectures as admirable models of *explanatory instruction*, for *expository preaching* (which is a distinct though kindred exercise) we should desiderate fuller and more frequent practical application of the passages explained. The amount and fulness of this must of course depend in great measure upon the character of the congregation. For such a congregation as would attend an early service in Ely Cathedral a hint for subsequent fuller consideration in private might suffice, but for the greater number of our ordinary church-goers it would be necessary to work out the application much more fully.

Apart from the value of the book for public use, it will be found useful, we believe, both by clergy and laity, for private study, and for reference in respect to questions both of harmony and exegesis, as a popular but by no means superficial commentary on S. Mark. The marginal references and the notes at the end of each lecture afford abundant suggestion and aid for further research. The frequent



references to the Talmud and Mishnah, as illustrating the Gospel record, form a peculiarly valuable feature of the book.

In this general recommendation we do not, of course, commit ourselves to every detail of explanation or expression. No commentator would expect this. One expression in particular we regret. Although it is abundantly clear that the author intended none but an orthodox meaning, we question whether this would be the sense in which the following words would be understood, concerning our Lord before the Sanhedrin (vol. ii. p. 256): 'Then, as the consciousness of His greatness came pouring in upon Him—some sudden inspiration perhaps to strengthen Him for the approaching crisis—He realized the whole iniquity of the trial.'

We must not omit to note Dr. Luckock's vindication, in the first lecture, of the symbolical figure of the Man as the emblem of S. Mark's Gospel, which so pre-eminently portrays the Sacred Humanity of our Lord. 'The Lion of S. Mark,' regarded exegetically, has indeed shown a strange want of discernment as to the distinguishing characteristics of the record both of the first and of the second Evangelist.

*A History of Canon Law, in conjunction with other Branches of Jurisprudence, &c.* By the Rev. J. DODD, M.A. (Oxford: Parker and Co., 1884.)

WE opened this treatise in the belief that the tempting promise of its title would be fulfilled, and that our modern ecclesiastical literature, in which the history of the canon law has as yet had no place, would at last possess this only guide to the just estimate and right understanding of that comprehensive and conflicting body of ecclesiastical law. It might be said, perhaps, that the title of our author promises too much, that *A History of Canon Law, in conjunction with other Branches of Jurisprudence*, and even straying into the interminable region of the Royal supremacy and the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, offers a programme so varied and endless, that a life would be insufficient for the composition of the work, and long and arduous labours needed for its study. The boldness of such an attempt must therefore prepare us for its failure, and it is no discredit to a writer even of varied learning and high purpose to have failed in such a herculean effort. It bears a close resemblance to the course of the mediæval chroniclers, who wrote a history of the world from the Creation, before they settled down to write the narrative of their own times, or to carry out the special object they had proposed to themselves. Unfortunately, like many of the works which this revived interest in the canon law has originated in recent years, the work before us is written with a view to the solution of present and pressing controversies rather than as a history standing alone, and independent of local and personal considerations. The revival of the study of the canon law in Germany did not take place under circumstances of such serious disadvantage. Böhmer, Maitrecht, and the learned Canonists of the Reformed Churches, writing from a purely historical and sci-

tific standpoint, were able to produce works as impartial in their treatment of the subject as they were profound in the learning they brought to bear upon it. We had hoped that our author would have availed himself of the lucid and methodical *Historia Juris Ecclesiastici et Pontificii* of Mastricht, and of the great Commentary of Böhmer, which at every stage of its progress carries back the reader to the history of the law as well as to its bearing and interpretation. But we find no mention of these writers, though their works are recognized and applauded even by the highest authorities of the Roman Church. Nor does our author refer in support of his views to the more enlightened Canonists of the Roman Church, Pierre d'Ailly, Zarabella, Gerson, Almain, and those who revived the study of the purer canon law after the great schism; nor yet to the profoundly learned and enlightened Tostatus, who led the way to the noble labours of Richer, De Marca, and the later Gallicans, and though last not least, to those of Bishops Ricci and Pannilini and their colleagues in the Assembly of Florence in 1787. Nor does the greatest of modern canonists, Van Espen, appear as an accredited authority in his pages. But while our author has carried us back to the first principles and origin of all law both human and divine, and burdened his pages with extracts from Hebrew, Greek, and Roman writers, which have no connexion whatever with his immediate subject, he has strangely limited the domain of the canon law itself, and has reduced it to the subjects of a purely ecclesiastical character within which it was originally confined. For (as Thomasius observes in his preface to the history of Mastricht):—

‘The canon law treats not only of ecclesiastical matters, but of secular ones—namely, property, the acquisition of property, testaments, contracts, offences, lawsuits, and almost everything which the civil law treats upon.’

Hence the scope of the work he prefaces extends to the ‘origin, progress, increments, collections, and authors of the great body of the canon law,’ which has been presented to the world in its perfect and final text in the recent edition of Dr. Richter and Dr. Friedberg. The prefacer of Mastricht, in enumerating the qualifications required in an expounder of the canon law, observes well that:—

‘The precedents and proofs taken from the civil law, ought not to be adduced and mixed up with it in order to show more clearly its connexion with the civil law.’

Then he recommends that—

‘Each title (or division) of the law should be carried back to a few, and those perspicuous principles.’

Finally:—

‘That a clear demonstration should be added, derived from ecclesiastical history, showing the periods to which each division belongs, and how far it is in agreement or at variance with the natural or Roman law, or with the manners of primitive Christians.’

We are bound to confess that none of these recommendations have been carried out in the work before us. The first four chapters cannot be said to have the slightest bearing upon the canon law

prop  
nor  
or c  
to th  
fori  
take  
and  
at t  
subj  
supr  
Rep  
seen  
entin  
law  
com  
led t  
the  
built  
most  
in re  
is le  
assu  
rega  
state  
whic  
that  
of th  
older  
the C  
in th  
and  
‘the  
A  
law i  
more  
a de  
Easte  
Bisho  
and  
way i  
ical  
the l  
of its  
ment  
appoi  
and  
histo  
canon  
Greek  
to sta

proper either of the Eastern or Roman Churches, whose origin cannot be carried up to the remote sources of heathen and Jewish law or custom, except in those special points in which the State confided to the Church a jurisdiction over civil causes, and questions *misti fori* came within its range. More than half the work before us is taken up with long and digressive chapters on general, Greek, Jewish, and Roman law, and we only arrive at the subject of the title-page at the fifth chapter (p. 150). The ninth and tenth enter upon a subject certainly unknown to the canon law proper, viz. the Royal supremacy, and the whole treatise culminates in a chapter on the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, a document which seems to have given the occasion, and even the inspiration, to the entire work. In tracing the connexion between the civil and the canon law (in the fourth chapter), the origin and history of the two, and the composite character of both, are absolutely lost sight of, and we are led to doubt whether the author has ever examined for himself either the *Corpus Furis Civilis* or the *Corpus Furis Canonici*, which was built up in 1151 upon the lines of the former, which it gradually but most effectually superseded. The student is left wholly in the dark in regard to the elements out of which this vast Code is formed, and is led to confuse the genuine and spurious portions of it, and to assume that it is a homogeneous work. The same ignorance in regard to the composite character of the civil law appears in the statement (p. 148) that 'it is neither more nor less than that law which governed the citizens of old Rome.' Is the writer unaware that the Codex and the Novellæ of Justinian form an integral part of the body of the civil law, and that the true representatives of the older legislation are the Digests which precede the later portions of the Code. Surely the Novellæ, which have the same relative place in the civil law as the Sixth Book of Decretals, the Clementines, and Extravagants occupy in the canon law, cannot be said to be 'the law which governed the citizens of old Rome.'

Approaching the point where the actual history of the canon law is supposed to begin, the insecurity of our guidance becomes more and more apparent. Here we had at least expected to find a description of the origin and growth of the canon law in the Eastern Church, so admirably illustrated in the great *Synodicon* of Bishop Beveridge, an examination of the so-called Apostolic Canons and those of Antioch, Ancyra, Gangre, and Laodicea, leading the way into the still more important legislation of the great Œcumenical Councils. We expected, moreover, to find some account of the later and more distinctive elements of the Eastern canon law, of its Digest in the Nomo-canon of Photius, and of its great commentators Balsamon and Zonaras; but again we experience disappointment. At p. 156, the usual popular confusion of the *dogmata* and *canones* of the Eastern Councils, so clearly separated in their history as well as in the 131st Novella of Justinian, recurs. The canon law is said (p. 160), to 'result from a combination of Roman, Greek, and Hebrew influences,' whereas it would be nearer the truth to state that it everywhere resisted these influences, and above all the

Jewish, and that it reversed many of the principles of the Roman law while adapting others to its purposes.<sup>1</sup> The entire history of the canon law of the Western Church is condensed into two or three extracts from Blackstone, Stephens, Selvaggius, and Sir Richard Bowyer, and the promise of a *History of Canon Law* is supposed to be fulfilled by a few quotations from popular works accessible to all, filling only seven out of nearly 300 pages of a work professing to give us an independent and original history. It is true that the sixth chapter brings us back to the Canons and Councils of the Church, and opens with the disclaimer of any intention 'to give a consecutive history of the events which led to the formation of the canon law, or of the great Councils of the Church.' But how is the compilation of a history of the canon law possible without such a consecutive narrative of its 'origin, growth, collections, and authors'—words which form the title of the invaluable treatise of Mاسترخت? The confusion between the *dogma* and the *canons* of the Councils continues in this chapter, and the doctrinal definitions of the Apostolic writings which are said to have been 'delivered once for all,' are reduced to the rank of those Canons and ecclesiastical laws which are liable to change and modification according to the needs of the present Church or the exigencies of any particular branch of it. Our author speaks of a period in which 'the Churches passed their own rules (not canons as yet),' forgetful that a *canon* is the proper equivalent for a *rule*,<sup>2</sup> and that the only contrast to a *canon* is a *law* (*jus*): the one term expressing a moral obligation, the other a legal one. Beginning with the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons, we are told that the latter have less authority than the former, though the Canons are properly a portion of the Eighth Book of the Constitutions, and have generally an earlier date assigned them, though not so early as that to which our author refers them (p. 171). But a far more serious question presents itself in the brief allusion to the Ante-Nicene Councils, at p. 172. While the somewhat doubtful Canons of Elvira (Illiberis) and those of Arles, neither of which form part of the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ*, are brought out into a strange prominence, the Councils of Antioch, of Laodicea, and of Gangre, whose Canons are believed to have been ratified at Nicæa, receive no mention whatever. Nor is less neglect shown to the Council of Rome against Novatus, and to the Canons of the African Councils which are incorporated both with the Eastern and Western Code, although the letters of S. Cyprian, which had properly no canonical authority, are quoted as possessing it.

The seventh chapter treats of the Jurisdiction of Bishops and Presbyters, but here the origin of jurisdiction and its distinction from order, the very first rule (if we may so term it) in the grammar

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, the method of computing the degrees of marriage—the course and conduct of suits, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Mاسترخت, after giving five meanings of *canon*, gives as its meaning in ecclesiastical law, 'Regula et norma disciplinæ sive politiæ eccl.' (*Hist. Jur. Can.* p. 7, ed. Halæ, 1719).

of the canon law, finds no place or mention. Yet the confusion of these terms lies at the very root of all our ecclesiastical controversies, and the clear understanding of them is the only clue to their just settlement. The statement that the Councils embodied in them 'a species of courts of justice, in which matters not only concerning ecclesiastics in particular but laymen also,' is made without the necessary intimation that this jurisdiction '*in foro externo*' was a privilege or concession granted by the State on the adoption of Christianity by the Empire. The student might thus be led into the belief that an inherent authority was claimed by the Church in every age, of determining even civil questions in an ecclesiastical court. The eighth chapter brings us to the most difficult and delicate of all the subjects of this history—the relations between the Church and State. Here the author might have profitably studied the *Codex* and the *Novellæ* of Justinian, to see how early the Church fell in the East into what would be now termed a developed Erastianism, while the study of the *Decretals* would have led him to trace the growth in the West of that great spiritual power which absorbed into itself in the period of its culmination every province of the ancient Imperial jurisdiction. From all that has been already said the conclusion will naturally be drawn that the work before us is neither a real history of the great Code of which it professes to treat, nor a safe and practical guidebook to a study which recent events in our Church have brought into a prominence it has never before attained to. To the student who has carefully traced the history of the canon law in its twofold division, and marked the stages of its development in the East and West, in the one a Synodical, in the other a Pontifical growth, the large field of universal law, human and divine, into which our author has led him may present many objects of interest, and suggest many facts and theories illustrating the complicated subject of his study. But to one who is entering upon the history of the canon law, and whose first object must be to find the first lines of that history clearly laid down, and the terminology of the science rigidly defined, the present work will be only misleading and confusing. He might as well attempt to learn the structure and laws of the human body from Pope's *Essay on Man* as to obtain a knowledge of the origin, progress, authorship, and structure of the Codes of the Eastern and Western Churches from a treatise like that before us.

*Lotze's System of Philosophy.* 2 vols. Part I. 'Logic.' In three Books: Of Thought; Of Investigation; and Of Knowledge. Part II. 'Metaphysic.' In three Books: Ontology; Cosmology; and Psychology. English translation. Edited by BERNARD BOSANQUET, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884.)

AT last the English student of philosophy may congratulate himself on having a translation, and that an excellent one, of Lotze's *System of Philosophy*. Commenced at the suggestion of, and partly executed by, the late Professor Green, whose thought in regard to fundamental

points was in harmony with that of the distinguished German philosopher, the translation was not completed before both these kindred spirits had passed away.

Herman Lotze, a native of the kingdom of Saxony, died at Berlin, in 1881, at the age of sixty-four. His life, many years of which were spent at Göttingen, had been the uneventful one of a philosopher who loved retirement. But he was a man of remarkable intellectual powers and wide culture, and had made his mark not only in his own professional line as a philosopher, but as a scientist, and even as a scholar. Though eminently successful as a lecturer, it was not until late in life that he could be prevailed upon to publish his views in a systematic form. His death prevented him from fully completing the scheme of publication which he then entered upon. But what he did publish is the product of mature wisdom, and is a most valuable counterpoise to the visionary construction on the one hand, and the melancholy destruction on the other hand, of some modern systems whose authors were his fellow-countrymen. It is, in fact, the German antidote to German poison.

Lotze was no mere metaphysician, spinning pretentious but baseless theories of the universe out of his own inner consciousness, but he combined with the philosophic temper in which so many scientists are lacking a wide acquaintance with science itself, and consequently he was able to appreciate both the strong and the weak points of science. While admitting and even maintaining the mechanical connexion of cause and effect within each of the provinces that science has made her own, he proclaimed the necessity, for the satisfaction of the human spirit and even as the logical basis of scientific procedure, of some conceptions with regard to the universe and with regard to the human mind, that science itself could not supply. He admitted the futility of much of the current metaphysical doctrine, yet he claimed and vindicated for metaphysics a real and important province, and showed that the contempt which some modern scientists profess for all knowledge that cannot be submitted to their tests is more justly deserved in regard to their negations or their agnosticism.

From this point of view the foundation stone of Lotze's system may be defined as faith in reason.

Faith and reason have been regarded ere now as hostile principles, and the question of their relation has been eagerly debated. In the view of some religious minds faith has been regarded as the supreme principle in such sort that the claim of reason has been but grudgingly allowed. The tendency on the other hand of some modern leaders of thought has been to extend the province of reason so widely as to leave no room at all for faith. The supposed opposition between the two principles is familiar enough in the sphere of definite religious teaching, but it really lies at the root of the deepest questions that can be asked with regard to the action of the human mind. In Lotze's philosophy, while the imperfections of reason are fully admitted, while the subjectivity of all human knowledge is frankly confessed, yet it is maintained that a knowledge of reality, of truth,



is the proper goal of the human mind, and that this goal is in fact partially attained. But on the other hand it is shown that this claim cannot be maintained, and consequently that all our supposed knowledge is valueless for the human spirit, unless we believe—what we cannot prove—that human reason is, after its measure, a reflection of Divine reason.

As it is not likely that many readers outside the comparatively small circle of professed students of philosophy will undertake the labour of working through the two volumes before us, and as the topics of our last paragraph are of capital importance, it may be well to expand the statement of them and introduce one or two quotations. The claim in behalf of reason is a modest one, though it suggests grand possibilities. S. Paul said 'We know in part,' and the philosopher, familiar with the vast conquests of science in these latter days, can but echo his words. It is but a partial knowledge of the system of things in which we live that is attainable. Even that partial knowledge is only gained after many failures. Much even of what seems to be knowledge may not be so after all. Many of our constructive efforts only succeed perhaps in raising a kind of scaffolding, not the permanent building of knowledge. Here, again, we hear something like the echo of S. Paul's 'When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away ;' and there are indications that the modern writer would adopt the words in the Apostle's sense, though the scaffolding and knowledge to which he is here referring belong to the present life.

The human mind, however, is not, nor can be so placed in regard to the universe as to have complete knowledge :—

'Only a mind which stood at the centre of the real world, not outside individual things, but penetrating them with its presence, could command such a view of reality as left nothing to look for, and was therefore the perfect image of it in its own being and activity. The human mind does not thus stand at the centre of things, but has a modest position somewhere in the extreme ramifications of reality.'<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, the character of subjectivity must for ever cling to our knowledge. Whether we are Idealists or Realists, all our knowledge of the external world depends upon the ideas of it which we have within us. But if it cannot be proved that our supposed knowledge is other than a delusion, it must at the same time be clear that no knowledge can ever be given us which will be free from a like suspicion. We have, however, the consolation of knowing that no intelligence whatever which 'stands in relation to anything beyond itself'<sup>2</sup> can escape from the same condition, and consequently that if subjectivity renders real knowledge impossible, no finite being whatever can possess real knowledge. This seems like a *reductio ad absurdum* of philosophical scepticism. But, in point of fact, as Lotze remarks, 'subjectivity settles nothing as to the truth or untruth of our knowledge.' He couples, however, with this the concession—

<sup>1</sup> Part I. Book I., 'Of Thought.' Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> Lotze's phrase is intended to exclude the Divine Mind from this otherwise universal condition with regard to knowledge.

a concession in form only, but in reality the statement of a most important truth—

‘Though it is true we are left with nothing but the confidence of Reason in itself, or the certainty of belief in the general truth that there is a meaning in the world, and that the nature of that reality which includes us in itself has given our spirit only such necessities of thought as harmonize with it.’

Even the sceptic, that is to say the man who professes to believe that no knowledge of truth is attainable, acknowledges in the very act of denial that which he denies. There is no meaning in the word ‘doubt’ except on the presupposition of some sort of acknowledged truths. Nor is the charge of inconsistency avoided, if instead of a point-blank denial of the possibility of attaining to truth the answer be modified to ‘non liquet.’ For, as our author cogently remarks—

‘There can be no meaning given to “liquet” if we have not in our mind certain conditions under which we should be prepared to affirm it, *i.e.* if we did not presuppose some unconditionally valid truth from which is derived our right to doubt whatever cannot be proved to be in agreement with it.’<sup>1</sup>

In other words, any decision whatever postulates the competence of thought. But if the sceptic is convicted of inconsistency, how fares it with a scientist who should profess to tread on the sure ground of experience, and surveying the universe from his little corner of it, to descry systematic connexion, law, and order everywhere? He, too, is the victim of a delusion if he imagines that he really dispenses with the principle of faith. He professes to explain facts; but what is the real meaning of explanation? Whence the need of it? Whence the right to demand it? To explain is to reduce what would otherwise be a mere coincidence between two facts to an inner relation, a relation apprehended by thought, of mutual dependence according to universal law. Consequently the demand for explanation arises from a conviction which is part of the furniture of the mind, and which outruns experience, that there is a mutual relation between facts according to law. In other words, explanation would not be demanded and would not be satisfying but for the conviction ‘that there is a meaning in the world, and that the nature of that reality which includes us in itself has given our spirit only such necessities of thought as harmonize with it.’ This formula, when translated out of philosophical into religious language, does not fall far short of the assertion that man was made in the image of God.

What then is the position of the scientist? If he will not accept the formula and admit the paramount necessity of faith even at the base of scientific inference, he must believe that the universe consists and for ever must consist of ‘know-nothings’—

‘and then  
What matters science unto men?’

Lotze, as we have said, admits the mechanical connexion of

<sup>1</sup> Part I. Book III. chap. i., ‘On Scepticism.’

things in every limited section of reality, but he adds the important consideration, that behind the section investigated 'one still uninvestigated may be conceived in the past as to which silence may be kept.'<sup>1</sup> Not that occasions do not arise for breaking the silence with the suggestion of possibilities. Take, for example, his treatment of 'beauty,' which, as he rightly says, only seems of value if it may be regarded as the fulfilment or manifestation of a living impulse, and not merely a lucky case of harmony between casually coincident elements. He will not, however, be induced by the æsthetic objection to deny even here the validity of the mechanical theory. The beauty which we behold is, he admits, mechanically connected with past states of the world. How then are the opposing views to be reconciled? Of the two solutions suggested, the most intelligible one is that the germ of beauty forms a part of the original creation, and that this marvellous germ, 'making itself felt through the whole mechanical chain of consequences, gives birth by single acts of its own to the beauty of single phenomena.'<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, even the 'causal nexus' leads him to look to something deeper than itself. Every student of philosophy is aware of the difficulty of understanding the simplest connexion of cause and effect. Lotze shows the futility of having recourse to the idea that only like things can act on like, which lies at the base of the denial of the duality of body and soul. He finds in Monism an escape from the difficulty. There is only one real independent Being. 'Things can only exist as parts of a single Being—separate relatively to our apprehension, but not actually independent.'<sup>3</sup> What appears to us in a given example of the 'causal nexus' as the passing over of an influence from one object to another, is really the operation of the one 'immanent' Being, that is, God.

But Lotze was no Pantheist. He did not confound God and the world. The world he conceived as called into existence by God, not continuing within the inner life of God, 'but entering on an existence of its own as a product which detaches itself from Him in an independence scarcely to be defined.'<sup>4</sup>

In the foregoing remarks we have made no attempt to give an outline of Lotze's philosophy. A mere analysis would either occupy too much space or would be unintelligible. What we have attempted has been to notice one or two points which are at once interesting to readers in general and deeply important.

*Drifting into Unbelief: an Appeal to Thinking Men.* By the Rev. R. F. HESSEY, M.A., Vicar of Basing. (London: Skeffington, 1885).

'INDECISION in matters of religion—that is to say, not making up our own minds upon the most vital of all questions; drifting—that is, leaving the helm, and handing over to circumstances and surroundings the responsibility of making up our minds for us—herein seems to lie a peril to Christianity at the present moment, which cannot easily be exaggerated.

<sup>1</sup> Part II. 'Metaphysic,' p. 117.

<sup>3</sup> Part II. p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> Part I. 'Logic,' p. 143.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 139.

'I shall not appear, I trust, presumptuous, or to be taking too much upon myself, if, realizing as I do, with my whole soul, the immensity of that danger, I venture to sound a note of warning, and endeavour, as God shall give me power, to speak a timely word of help.'

With these words commences the little book the title of which stands at the head of this notice. We quote them because they express concisely both the object of the work itself and the *animus* of the writer. Recently we had the pleasure of noticing 'An Appeal' by Mr. Hessey 'to the 20,000 Clergy' of our Church to prepare for direct combat with the unbelief of the day. That effort appears to have met with much acceptance, for more than one edition has been called for. *Drifting into Unbelief* addresses itself to a wider range of readers, and warns both clergy and laity against a very significant and dangerous tendency of the present time. It is perspicuously divided into seven sections. The first of these deals with those who may be regarded as 'more sinned against than sinning,' and whose difficulties may be traced to faulty bringing up or unwholesome surroundings. The second treats of those mixed cases where there has been a lack of moral watchfulness. Mr. Hessey has obviously read much, and his mind has assimilated, so to speak, his varied reading. But he does not care to affect originality. His aim is rather to combine every element of persuasion, moral and intellectual, as, for instance, authority, arrest of attention, and diversity of utterance, which may influence a thinking man. And, with this view, he has, we think, judged wisely in giving references to, and in quoting in many instances the actual words of, important writers, instead of stating the points in question in language of his own. Many will be induced to follow up an extract from an author of great name.

It may be said generally that he seems to be endeavouring to solve the problem, 'How can Christian evidences be placed before the mind in such a form as to invite and kindle with enthusiasm, instead of chilling and repelling?' And he is also anxious to try how far it is possible, by hint or implication, to put his readers, almost before they are aware, in possession of the real state of what may be their own case.

Mention has been already made of sections 1 and 2. The latter is exceedingly interesting, and brings out, as requirements for the doubter, 1, the life; 2, research; 3, authority; 4, action. We have not space for a long extract, but the following passage (p. 40) will indicate Mr. Hessey's method of treatment:—

'That which is really a sign of returning moral health—viz. an increasing desire to find that a religion is true, which so approves itself to all that is holiest and noblest in our nature—even *that* is turned, by the sensitive and anxious conscience, into a fresh occasion of stumbling. "Ought I not to be completely neutral? Must I not suspect this fresh bias towards a creed which promises so much to those who embrace it?" And thus *that*, without which conviction would *never* be complete, that further stage, when the intellect begins to "be invested with a glowing atmosphere of passion" (as Foster justly insists *must* be the case), "under the influence of which the cold dictates of reason take fire, and spring into active powers"—that very stage of forward movement is turned into

an impediment to final decision. By a sort of utterly mistaken heroism, the fully and really convinced inquirer will yet turn aside, just when he is reaching the goal, only because he is thrilled with joy as the moment nears for grasping the prize.'

But we must hasten on. 'The Theistic Question,' 'Agnosticism,' and 'The Freedom of the Will' are touched upon in the next three sections with considerable vigour and incisiveness. The sixth deals with the 'anxious suspicion that possibly there may be competitors to Christ,' as a cause of 'drifting.' The seventh and last sets forth and denounces as a selfish element what has been indulgently called 'the luxury of hesitation.'

We lay down the *Appeal* with reluctance, recommending the book very strongly to all whom it may concern.

*The Official Year-Book of the Church of England.* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1885.)

THE labours of the Liberation Society have had one result which its members can have little expected. Before they commenced, the Church of England was content to do her work, and to leave it to tell its own tale. There was no counting up of what had been done, no chronicling of the good she was accomplishing. Those who did the most were most alive to existing deficiencies, and in contemplating what remained undone they were little disposed to make much of what had been done. The misrepresentations of the Liberation Society have changed the aspect of affairs. The unscrupulous, and often untruthful, charges which its agents have brought against the Church, have compelled her sons to vindicate her faithfulness to the solemn trust committed to her; and this they have sought to do by plain and simple statements of the work she is doing. If we are not mistaken, the book before us owes its existence to this cause. It is designed to be an answer to the charge of want of diligence and of inadequate response to the calls of duty of which we sometimes hear; and a more satisfactory answer could not be looked for. The volume before us is the third which has been issued, and we notice with pleasure that each year the editor has greatly improved the book, partly by better summarizing the work of the year, and partly by speaking of fresh fields of work concerning which it has taken longer time to obtain accurate information. Under the former of these heads we note the better form in which the proceedings of the Church Congress are presented. In 1883 these were detailed in an imperfect manner in fifteen pages; this year we have in three all that can be profitably given in a concise form. Then in the first volume the editor had evidently taken great pains to furnish not merely the names of the books which could be included under the title of 'Recent Church Literature,' but a brief summary of their contents, with criticisms upon them. This last feature is now entirely omitted, and with great advantage, as in the limited space which could be allotted to it there was no possibility of its being satisfactorily executed. The statistical tables are also much improved; the detailed statement of the amount spent on church building and restoration in 1883 is especially interest-

VOL. XX.—NO. XXXIX.

R

ing, whilst the statistical statement of buildings other than parish and district churches used for public worship is much more complete than any which has previously appeared. And whilst it shows the large and increasing extent to which the Church is carrying on her missionary work at home, it also tells of her willingness to utilize the services of laymen in unconsecrated buildings, for we find that there are no fewer than 2,935 buildings in which public worship is systematically provided throughout the year, and in which such worship is conducted wholly or partially by laymen. The section on Clerical and Lay Agencies is greatly improved by including not only a larger number of diocesan funds which have been recently started, but also by giving a complete list of the home missions supported by the universities and public schools. We have also, for the first time, sections on Convalescent Homes and Cottage Hospitals, on Clergy Homes of Rest, on Episcopal Visitations, and on Diocesan Clergy Charities. It speaks well for the skill with which the editor has performed his task that he has compressed what he has to say in pages numbering one hundred fewer than there were in last year's book, although he has brought forward many new subjects of interest. When we called attention to the volume published two years since, we felt compelled to notice unfavourably some portions of the book: it is with great pleasure that we are now able to say that the mistakes then made seem to have been corrected. There is, however, still some room for increased vigilance on the part of the editor. *E.g.*, in the diocesan statistics (p. 486) it is stated that the diocese of Canterbury includes the 'entire county of Kent, parts of Surrey and Sussex'; that Chichester includes the 'entire county of Sussex, with small parts of Kent'; Rochester, 'parts of Kent and Surrey, and portions of Sussex.' Here there must be mistakes. The diocese of Southwell is not mentioned, and Lincoln and Lichfield are described as if still undivided. These are, however, very small matters, and we can confidently recommend this excellent book to those of our readers who wish to know what the Church of England is doing through her manifold organizations; and we confidently hope that the knowledge of what is being done in so many fields of labour will stimulate to fresh exertion those responsible for places where a less vigorous life is being manifested; and that all true sons of the Church may take courage, when they see these marks of God's blessing around them, to defend more vigorously the great spiritual institution for which they are responsible in this their day.

*Compendium of English Church History from 1688 to 1830.* With a Preface by J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.)

THIS book is intended for the use of candidates for the ordinary theological degree, and it is really good in parts; but we can hardly recommend any candidate who is a Churchman to take it upon trust. He must not be misled by the promise of the title-page that it is introduced by a preface from Dr. Lumby's pen. The preface barely extends to two pages; it simply tells the reader that Dr. Lumby is 'in a degree responsible for the book,' and shows how slight his



responsibility is. We are tempted to describe it as emphatically a publisher's educational venture, and we need hardly say what such a phrase too often implies. The book is a medley of guesses and inaccuracies. The writer appears to have started with a fund of traditional impressions, the truth of which he had taken upon trust and never questioned; he seems next to have consulted a number of books, not always wisely selected, in order to procure a chronologically arranged series of confirmations of his traditional impressions. Where did he learn that in Queen Anne's reign 'Dissent was increasing'? Dissenting academies might increase, but they did not add to the strength of Dissent. They often trained candidates for holy orders, as in the case of Bishop Butler, Archbishop Secker, Samuel Wesley, and several others. Even in the next generation a candidate for holy orders was sent to Dr. Doddridge's Dissenting Academy for clerical education. He supplies a contradiction to his own statement when he tells us, on another page, that in Queen Anne's reign 'Popular feeling was always more or less opposed to Dissent.' Amongst what class was it increasing? There is every reason to believe that but for the Methodist and Evangelical movements, both of which were products of the inherent vitality of the English Church, Protestant Dissent would have died of sheer inanition. He must have a strange ignorance of Lutheranism to dare to say that 'the Lutheran views which the King (George I.) professed were more likely to raise the hopes of Dissenters than of Churchmen.' All English Dissent, except Quakerism, had been Calvinist for two centuries, and a horror of 'Lutheran views' as semi-popish, or more popish even than the English Church, was an unbroken tradition of the English Puritans. George I. probably knew and cared as much about Lutheranism as he did about the English Church. The Presbyterian Adam Stewart, in his controversy with the Independents as to which of the two sects 'yielded the most to the civil magistrate,' asked, 'What if we had a Christian prince who were a Lutheran, an Anabaptist, a Socinian, or a Papist?' He implies that the Presbyterians and Independents were alike fundamentally Anti-Lutheran, and when he speaks afterwards of 'an orthodox prince' he plainly means a Calvinist. It is still more significant that the Lutheran settlers in Dublin feared at first to communicate at the altars of the Irish Church because they imagined that the Church held Calvinist or Zwinglian views as to the Presence in the Eucharist. Charles Leslie, the Nonjuror, six years before George's accession, cited the Lutherans against the Scotch and Dutch Presbyterians as witnesses to 'our doctrine.' The writer jauntily observes that 'the early part of the eighteenth century was a dull, prosaic time, lacking nearly all real devotion and frightened at the mere name of enthusiasm.' It was more frightened at 'the name' than at the thing, for very good reasons, which he would find explained by Henry More, or Norris, or Whichcot. The dissenting authors of the *Independent Whig* complained in 1731 that 'many Churchmen were notable enthusiasts.' 'Just such enthusiasm have we all seen,' they add, 'raised by a blind zeal for the Church, and it is this very zeal, blind indeed, which has more than once filled

half the nation with religious fury.' They attacked the holy Bishop Wilson as an 'enthusiast,' and applied the term to all contemporary High Churchmen. But this writer's blackening of the early part of the century is a mere rhetorical trick for heightening by contrast the brilliant light kindled by the Methodists and Evangelicals in the middle and end of it. The force of all contemporary testimony goes to prove beyond denial that the clergy were never more popular with the whole nation than during that very period in which the writer asserts that 'the hold of the Church was loosened on the hearts of the people.' The authors of the *Independent Whig* complained in 1732, 'The mob and the many will always be orthodox, always true to the Church, to holy days, and pious rioting.' Twelve years earlier (1720) the same writers had taunted the High Church clergy with 'the constancy of the mob to the Church.' That the attachment which lasted so long was not permanent was due partly to the pastoral negligence and inefficiency of the Whig bishops, whom the *Independent Whig* lauded, and partly to the Methodist and Evangelical substitution of man's own self-consciousness of 'conversion' in the place of the act of God in baptism, as the generative principle of the true 'Church.' The writer attributes everything good to Wesley, Whitefield, and the Evangelicals. His utter incapacity to take a scientific grasp of the religious history of the eighteenth century is proved by his total silence on the loss of the Church and the gain of Dissent from the two movements, both of which spring up in the bosom of the Church. He has no reference to the immense influence of Tom Paine's writings upon the working classes at the end of the century—that is, upon the very class which, by the evidence of contemporary Dissenters, was most enthusiastic for the Church in the beginning of the century. The truth is that the Methodists succeeded in persuading thousands that the religion which they had was worthless, and only converted the minority to the religion which they offered them in its stead. The view of the eighteenth century inherited by the author, and his traditional estimate of its spiritual poverty apart from Methodism, stand in glaring contrast to the very optimistic view of its religious character taken by pious contemporaries who were not Methodists. Proofs of this may be found in Doddridge's correspondence. Bishop Warburton thanked Doddridge in 1747 'for the distinction which you settle' (in his *Life of Colonel Gardiner*) 'between piety and enthusiasm. It is highly just and important, and very necessary for these times.' Gilbert West, the author of the then famous evidential book, *Observations on the Resurrection*, wrote to Doddridge in 1748, thanking him for his *Life of Colonel Gardiner*, but regretting that he had 'inserted so many of those rapturous strains of piety which Colonel Gardiner poured into the bosoms of his friends.' He was afraid that 'these strains will give the whole character of Colonel Gardiner an air of enthusiasm.' He adds that Doddridge's intimate knowledge of that excellent man must have kept him 'from suspecting' this of him. He takes it for granted that 'enthusiasm,' such as the Wesleys were exhibiting, was a thing abhorred by every educated Christian, Churchman or Dissenter. It is in the end of the same letter that Gilbert West gives his excessively optimistic estimate of the religious character

of the eighteenth century. 'I am glad to find that Christianity begins to be so well understood and taught by many men of parts and learning in all sects; the fruits of which appear in a candour and charity unknown to all the ages of the Church except the Primitive, I had almost said the Apostolic age. Does not this give you a prospect, though perhaps still very distant, of completion of the famous prophecy that speaks of the lion and the lamb lying down together in the kingdom of the Messiah?' Nathanael Neal, a strong Dissenter, son of the historian of the Puritans, in a long letter to Doddridge in 1743, couples together 'Enthusiasts and Deists' as the two great enemies of true religion, and asserts that the 'Enthusiasts'—doubtless meaning the Wesleys—'by their principles are laying a foundation of Deism, however they may abhor it in their intentions. It behoves us surely to see to it that we give them no assistance in that work. Whatever might be the case in the country, we in this City should be swallowed up in a sea of Deism if the enthusiastic notions of a particular set of men should prevail.' Neal adds that he was lately 'in a mixed company of Deists, where the countenance which a certain eminent divine had given to some reputed enthusiasts was mentioned by one of the Deists in support of this position—that the most learned and considerable among Christian divines who were really honest men were enthusiasts.' Hence Neal, who was the executor of Dr. Watts, concluded that it was the duty and interest of Dissenters to resist and discourage 'enthusiasm.' The biographer of Charles of Bala, nearly at the same date (1740), speaking of the first great 'awakening' in Wales, says: 'True religion had forsaken the country. There was nothing like the semblance of it in the Church; nor was there much of it among the few Dissenters.' This famous 'Revival,' it should be remembered, and the consequent gigantic increase of Dissent, did not spring from the inherent force of Dissent itself, but was wholly the work of enthusiastic priests of the Church of England, who built chapels which fell into dissenting hands. The first revival commenced while Rowland was saying the Litany in church, at the petition beginning 'By the mystery of Thy holy Incarnation.'

*The Gospel of Divine Humanity. A reconsideration of Christian doctrine in the light of a central principle.* (London: Elliot Stock, 1884.)

THIS very thoughtful book contains a series of fourteen essays upon the deepest religious subjects. It is evidently the work of a refined and cultured mind, and is written with such transparent sincerity, with so much of sympathy for all religious conviction, however different from the author's own conclusions, and is so reverent and tender in its handling of sacred things, that it commands the respect, as its intellectual qualities will secure the attention, of earnest readers. The author has been troubled by the increasing number of those who do not accept orthodox Christianity; and he is persuaded that the fault very largely is attributable not to the mental or moral attitude of those who reject Christianity, but to the fact that prevailing conceptions of God and ordinary presentations of Christian truth are 'incongruous to the intellect and repugnant to the moral sense of

many minds.' To meet this difficulty, he proposes a reconsideration of Christian doctrine in the light of what may be fairly described as a modified Pantheism. Starting from S. Paul's assertion that 'in God we live, and move, and have our being,' and that 'we are God's offspring,' he is not afraid to face all mysteries, and to determine all problems by stern logical deduction from what he deems irrefutable premises.

'God is all-wise, all-powerful, and all good ;  
I speak to those alone who hold Him so :  
All-wise, and *knoweth* therefore what is best ;  
All-good, and *willeth* therefore what is best ;  
All-powerful, *can do* therefore what is best ;  
And if He can, why, *must*.'

(Quoted on p. 104.)

These quotations may serve as the key of the author's position. Humanity, according to his view, including every individual member of it, is one body—'the Body of God,' and therefore Divine. Sonship, having once existed in the mind of the Eternal, is unchangeable, and therefore inalienable. Sin is resolved into the necessary contrast required to bring out the true value of righteousness ; so that—

'Bearing in mind the essential character of God as love, there need be no difficulty in reconciling human temporary bondage to evil or defective life, in order that the individual sinner and sufferer, as well as the race, may be redeemed to the uttermost' (p. 93).

'They who know God as all-embracing Almighty love *have risen above all appearances to the contrary, whether of the letter of Scripture or of providential dealings in nature ; for to limit Divine love in any respect or degree is so far to deny God*' (p. 259).

The ultimate conclusion is that, despite some men's obstinate resistance here on earth to the influence of the Holy Spirit, all will eventually be subdued by the power of Divine love, and no one—annihilation being held to be impossible—will perish eternally.

It would exceed the limits of a short notice if we were to enter fully into the reasons against accepting the author's conclusions. The passage which we have italicized is significant of the error into which we think the author, with the best intentions, has been unconsciously betrayed, viz. that of logical reasoning upon premises too narrow to include the whole truth. To what purpose is the appeal to Scripture on which he founds his argument, if the higher testimony of an inward light is to raise the inquirers above *all appearance of its letter*? Such reasoning can only establish a foregone conclusion. But apart altogether from the Universalism which the author labours to prove, and from the mysticism with which his writing is tinged, his book contains much that will repay careful perusal.

*Histoire du Culte des Divinités d'Alexandrie (Sérapis, Isis, Harpocrate, Anubis) hors de l'Égypte*, depuis les origines jusqu'à la naissance de l'École néo-platonicienne. Par M. GEORGES LAFAYE, ancien membre de l'École française de Rome. Avec cinq planches. (Paris : Thorin, 1884.)

M. LAFAYE, one of the most brilliant members of the French school established at Rome, has just published a remarkable work on a

subject which must always be of great interest to the philosopher who directs his attention to the history of religion. What was the creed of the Egyptians? In what relation does it stand to the mythology of Greece and of Rome, to the teaching of the Neo-Platonists, and to Christianity? Two series of documents, or *pièces justificatives*, present themselves here to the scholar: written texts and works of art. Hence the division naturally adopted by M. Lafaye. The volume is terminated by a very complete catalogue of the monuments of various kinds, architectural fragments, statues, coins, tablets, inscriptions, which time has handed down to us.

M. Lafaye discusses in the first place the religion of the ancient Egyptians. He shows that at a certain period of its existence it assumed a monotheistic tendency, and he explains how it was affected by the influence of Hellenism. The Greeks, says our author, have often been accused of seeing in the ancient mythologies merely a counterpart of their own; in reality they believed that all the religions of the world have a common substratum, and they wanted to throw down the barriers of nationality which separated from each other creeds originally sprung from the same source. The religious eclecticism of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonists only appeared during the second century of the Christian era, but it was evident long before that eclecticism was to be the supreme goal of all philosophy.

After giving us an historical *résumé* of Alexandrian worship in Athens and in Rome, M. Lafaye enumerates the texts which should be consulted on the subject. Formerly it was universally thought that classical literature constituted the only source of information respecting the religions of the Egyptians; but the discoveries of recent travellers have destroyed this view, and since the days of Champollion it has become the fashion to despise the authors of Greece and of Italy as guides to our knowledge of the subject. But one form of exaggeration is as bad as another. Apuleius, Lucian, Plutarch, Ovid, Catullus, etc., may not be great helps to us in our studies, and yet they are valuable, inasmuch as they let us know what attitude the polite society of those days assumed towards Egyptian traditions, and with what feelings they regarded those strange deities of the Pantheon at Thebes.

What had the deities we are now alluding to to teach to the world? What was the doctrine bearing upon the personalities of Isis, Osiris, and Serapis? Let us notice, in the first place, that tendency to naturalism which is the essence of all heathen philosophy, and which made the Alexandrines persevere in the ways of polytheism; then we observe, also, a decided current of mysticism proclaiming the necessity for the soul to be absorbed in the deity; finally, we notice the longing for some spiritual authority which shall clearly define the doctrine, invest it with a rational form, and make us know God.

The triumph of the Alexandrian doctrines and their extreme popularity are easily explained, says M. Lafaye, and the superiority of their character over the Greco-Roman religious institutions would suffice alone to justify the favour they enjoyed. It has been noticed

that Egypt adopted Christianity at a comparatively late date, and that it began to play an important part in ecclesiastical history only with the commencement of the third century. The reason of this fact is merely that Egypt had Philo and the Therapeutæ; the doctrine taught by them was a kind of modified gospel, which seemed to the thinking part of the community as good and as complete as the lessons inculcated by the Church. M. Lafaye does not believe that the forerunners of Neo-Platonism borrowed anything from Christianity. Philo, Plutarch, Apuleius had no more to do with Saint Paul than Seneca; they merely acted under the influence of a general tendency which was destroying the very foundations of ancient society. Against the universal idea that the things of this world alone deserve our attention, against the *carpe diem* principle, they raised an energetic protest, and taught that the life after death, the re-union with God, are the sole things which are entitled to our care. To a nation deprived of political rights, such as the Romans were when the imperial *régime* took the place of republican institutions, two motives of action and two only remain: the pursuit of pleasure, the unbridled satisfaction of man's lower propensities on the one hand, and the absolute forsaking of all sublunary interests on the other. The Alexandrines chose the latter, and thus obtained an immense superiority over the gross polytheism of antiquity. It was not till the end of the second century that an interchange of ideas took place between them and Christianity; they contrived to introduce into the doctrines of orthodoxy some of their favourite theories, receiving from Christianity in return, especially during the reign of Julian the Apostate, habits of discipline and principles of morality which, for a short season, enabled them to maintain their ground as a kind of semi-religious, semi-philosophical school.

Such are the conclusions at which M. Lafaye has arrived. We must now say a word or two about the part of his volume dealing with monuments and artistic remains. A long chapter is devoted to an interesting description of the Isium at Pompeii, followed by an account of the various Alexandrian temples which existed in Rome. Our author shows very well how the alliance between Hellenism and Neo-Platonism combined to define the religious character of these buildings, and to give them their distinctive originality. The inscriptions, gems, and statues come next, some of them being reproduced by photography. The general and final result of this excursion in the domains of art is, that the Alexandrian form of worship was essentially eclectic, and that it would be a mistake to seek on the banks of the Nile for the counterpart of the Greek deities. The Egyptians reduced heathenism to its minimum, and instead of offering to the worship of the multitude the representation of idealized beauty, their aim was to impress man with the deep feeling of his nothingness. '*Pulvis es*' was their favourite motto.

*Bibliothèque Oratorienne*, publiée par le R. P. INGOLD. Vols. I. II. III. (Paris: Poussielgue, 1882-3.)

FATHER INGOLD is already known by a very interesting and complete biographical essay on the French Oratory, full of the most valuable



details, and containing, especially on the celebrated Biblical commentator Richard Simon, a mass of information. He has just begun to publish, under the title *Bibliothèque Oratorienne*, a series of volumes of a miscellaneous kind, biographies, sermons, and works of edification. Three of these, now before us, are merely annotated and revised reprints of Cloyseault's *Vies de quelques Prêtres de l'Oratoire*, and commend themselves to our attention by the historical importance of some of the persons whose lives they relate. Very few English readers, of course, know even the names of Gibieuf, Le Fèvre, Vignier, and Romans; but no student acquainted with the French seventeenth century can have forgotten De Condren and De Bérulle; no admirer of genuine pulpit eloquence has not admired the sermons of Massillon and Mascaron.

Persons who have leisure should turn to M. l'Abbé Houssaye for a complete and masterly history of the eminent man who founded the French Oratory; those whose time is more limited will find a simple but satisfactory account of him in the first volume of the *Bibliothèque Oratorienne*. At an epoch when the Gallican Church seemed on the verge of destruction, on one side attacked by the Reformers, on the other a prey to deep-seated disease from within, De Bérulle, together with Olier, Vincent de Paul, and Bourdoise attempted to bring about a work of complete regeneration, and the success which the first-named of these ecclesiastics obtained sufficiently proved that he had indeed met a pressing want of the age in which he lived. It was no small merit for him to have numbered amongst his adversaries Cardinal Richelieu and the revolutionary Coadjutor of Paris, Cardinal de Retz; decided superiority on his part alone could excite the jealousy of these ambitious men; and the signal services which he rendered to Louis XIII., both in negotiating the peace of Monçon, and in determining the marriage of the Princess Henrietta-Maria of France with the Prince of Wales, were well qualified to make the suspicious Prime Minister fear lest he should have a formidable rival at the Court of the Louvre. There stood the Jesuits besides, unable to brook the slightest rivalry, and dreading to find in De Bérulle and his coadjutors powerful rivals. Were they to see their reputations and their influence fade away before the skill of a novice? Were they to find their character as educationists destroyed as well as their political tenets? The superior of the French Oratory triumphed over all the opposition stirred up against him, except that of Richelieu, who compelled him to leave the Court. The marriage of the Princess Henrietta-Maria may have been disastrous for England, but that it was conducted with an extraordinary amount of skill cannot be doubted, and the Prime Minister thought that within the limits of France there ought not to be more than one person experienced in the mysteries of statecraft.

Charles de Condren, who succeeded De Bérulle as superior-general of the Oratory, had a still more difficult part to play, for he was confessor to Gaston, Duke of Orleans, one of the most despicable and worthless princes of the seventeenth century; and, in addition to the sorrow he felt in seeing that no amount of advice or entreaty could bring under control an essentially corrupt nature, he had to

bear the humiliation of being regarded as a kind of spy purposely placed by Richelieu to watch over the conduct of an intriguing, ambitious, and at the same time cowardly, man, who was always engaged in some plot against the Government.

The most prominent figure in Father Ingold's second volume is no doubt Sénault, who had his share in the Gallican reform, or attempt at reform, in the seventeenth century. Preaching was his special vocation, and it is to him indirectly that the French pulpit is indebted for the genius of Bossuet, the brilliancy of Fléchier, and the style of Massillon. It is not too much to say that, before Sénault, sacred eloquence amongst our neighbours on the other side of the channel was below contempt: no order, no method, no dignity; an affected display of erudition, relieved by coarse jokes and anecdotes of the most questionable character. The time was not far gone when the preachers of the 'League' period excited in their sermons the Parisian mob to rebellion, and denounced in their scandalous addresses Henry III. and the King of Navarre to the blind fury of the Ultramontanists. Sénault soon perceived the amount of reform to be accomplished, and he determined upon bringing it about. He applied himself to the study, not only of divinity and of the Fathers, but also of French literature in the best models it could then offer to men of taste, and we know that he learnt from the writings of Amyot the art of elegant composition. He did, in fact, for pulpit eloquence what Lemaître did for the bar, and both these celebrated men enjoy still a reputation which has survived all the caprices of taste. It is somewhat singular that not one of the sermons of Sénault has been handed down to us, and it would be unfair to judge him from his funeral orations, which cannot be compared even to some of Mascaron's best. Sénault was superior-general of the Oratory when he died, August 3, 1672. The third volume of Father Ingold's work is devoted to an account of Sainte Marthe's generalship; it is completed by an excellent alphabetical index to the three volumes, and a map of 'Oratorian France.'

*Société des Etudes Juives.* 1. *Revue des Etudes Juives.* Nos. 13-15, Septembre 1883—July 1884. *Annuaire de la Société des Etudes Juives.* 1884. (Paris: Durlacher.)

WE have often wished to call the attention of our readers to a useful society which, although of comparatively recent creation, has already done much excellent work, and has contributed in no mean degree to the progress of Biblical, historical, and philological studies. We mean the *Société des Etudes Juives*. The committee of this society includes names of *savants* well known to the literary world; and a body which boasts of men such as Messrs. Hartwig Derenbourg, Moses Schwab, Neubauer, &c., deserves the attention of all impartial and earnest scholars. Under the title of *Revue des Etudes Juives* the society in question publishes a quarterly Review, the last three numbers of which are now before us, and which we purpose briefly to examine. Each number consists—1, of original articles on points of history or Biblical criticism; 2, of short notes and miscellaneous jottings; 3, of reviews;

4, of  
world  
this  
num  
publ  
A  
Revue  
very  
know  
the s  
of As  
Scha  
this  
M. G  
and  
the l  
C  
the P  
Hebr  
tingu  
him i  
subje  
M. K  
which  
Zuric  
T  
State  
discu  
perf  
part  
to pu  
suffer  
was  
they  
the u  
the c  
conce  
them  
the s  
devot  
ment  
spirit  
relati  
the s  
such  
moder  
T  
the v  
the in  
M. de

4, of intelligence respecting Semitism in the various parts of the world, accounts of committee meetings, &c. The *collaborateurs* of this Review are not exclusively Jews, for we find amongst their number M. Renan, M. Ulysse Robert, inspector-general of French public libraries, M. de Maulde, and others.

As an illustration of the style of articles which are inserted in the *Revue des Etudes Juives* we may perhaps be allowed to mention a very interesting one (*Revue*, No. 15) by M. Israel Levi, on a well-known legend contained in the Babylon Talmud, and which describes the successful attempt which King Solomon made, through the help of Asmodeus, to secure the assistance of the mysterious animal called Schamir towards the construction of the Temple. M. Lévi compares this story with that of the angel and the hermit as analysed by M. Gaston Paris (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres*), and takes the opportunity of showing the Eastern origin of most of the legends given by mediæval writers.

Cardinal Richelieu, as our readers are aware, was the founder of the Paris *Bibliothèque Royale*; anxious to enrich it by the addition of Hebrew works, both printed and MSS., he commissioned two distinguished men, Jean Tileman Stella de Téry and Morimont, to help him in this matter, and Stella corresponded with the Buxtorfs on the subject. The negotiations arising in consequence have supplied M. Kayserling with the materials for a curious article (No. 15), in which several letters belonging to the public libraries of Bâle and Zurich are transcribed and commented on.

The political condition of the Jews in the French Pontifical States (Avignon, and department of Vaucluse in general) is ably discussed by M. de Maulde (No. 14). From this essay it seems perfectly clear that the Jewish community, which had settled in that part of France at a very early time, not only had no annoyances to put up with from their Christian neighbours, no persecutions to suffer, but that the Papal Legislation, so far as they were concerned, was of the most liberal nature, and that whilst for ordinary cases they were, of course, subjected to the common law, and amenable to the usual courts and tribunals, yet so far as the practices of religion, the celebration of worship, and the management of schools were concerned, they enjoyed absolute freedom. On the part of the Jews themselves, the statutes which they established, far from manifesting the slightest sentiment of hatred against the Christians, express the devotedness and respect of the community for the Pontifical government. It is quite evident, therefore, that the supposed arbitrary spirit hitherto ascribed by historians to the Pope's agents in their relations with the Jews has been very much exaggerated, and during the sixteenth century alone, under the *régime* of militant Pontiffs, such as Julius II., was there a marked departure from that spirit of moderation and justice.

The obligation to wear a distinct dress, enforced upon the Jews in the various localities where they resided, was applied, naturally, to the inhabitants of Avignon as well as elsewhere; it is mentioned in M. de Maulde's article, and has besides furnished M. Ulysse Robert

with the materials for a very interesting discussion (*Etude sur la route des Juifs depuis le xiii<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. *Revue*, Nos. 12, 13).

Amongst the bibliographical notices let us mention M. Derenbourg's review of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, vol. i. (No. 15), and the miscellaneous criticisms which complete the 14th fasciculus; these are by M. Isidore Loeb.

The *Société des Etudes Juives*, in addition to its Review, issues also a Year-Book; the third volume is now before us. It contains the rules of the society, the list of its members, and other matter of temporary interest; but we have noticed also with much satisfaction several articles of permanent value; thus M. Renan's lecture on the original identity of Judaism and Christianity, and their gradual separation, and M. Loeb's singularly interesting account of Borach Lévi, and of the trial he had to undergo in France, during the middle of the last century. Rabbi Astruc's address on Anti-Semitism is also worth reading as an *ouvrage de circonstance*; after showing the various phases which the spirit of intolerance has gone through in times past, he proves that the present movement cannot last, whether we consider the subject from the point of view of material interests, religious dogmatism, or politics. It is a mere incident, deplorable indeed, but not likely to lead to any serious consequences for the Semitic race.

*Berner Beiträge zur Geschichte der Schweizerischen Reformationskirchen.* Mit weiteren Beiträgen vermehrt und herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH NIPPOLD. (Bern: K. J. Wyss, 1884.)

THIS thick volume contains a series of essays by pastors of the Reformed Church of the Canton of Bern, edited by the well-known ecclesiastical historian Professor Friedrich Nippold, late of Bern and now of Jena. They all point in one direction—the incompleteness of 'the Reformation' in Switzerland, owing to its departure from its own original ideal, which, there as elsewhere, was the correction and amendment of the existing Church and not the creation of entirely new institutions. The ideal of reform, inherited from Constance and Basel, was deformed and perverted through the timorous refusal of the bishops to act up to their position as the natural leaders of the reform which their Churches demanded. This was due, in Switzerland especially, to the not very natural position of the bishops as temporal princes, and to their postponement of their spiritual to their secular relations. It was the same state of things, on a very modified scale, which drove Dr. Seabury, the elect of the Connecticut clergy, to apply to the Scottish bishops for the episcopal consecration which the English archbishops were too timorous and too 'political,' in the old sense of that adjective, to confer upon him. There are curious instances in this volume of the tenacity with which the Swiss bishops clung to their merely temporal rights over their Protestant subjects, long after the latter had refused to acknowledge their spiritual character as fathers in God. The Prince Bishop of Basel, for example, was the 'Obrigkeith,' or secular sovereign, of numbers of parishes which had become Protestant.

When  
poral  
The  
of Pr  
Blare  
of th  
true  
extra  
and e  
spirit  
firmed  
sion o  
the m  
enjoy  
So in  
nomin  
even  
maint  
mann  
'coun  
Paul  
mater  
Max  
crowd  
hesita  
clearly  
here,  
get ri  
These  
pold i  
to ha  
tor's p  
times.  
restor  
best r  
pressu  
intend  
his ow  
comm  
'Lives  
Church  
Bæda.  
the Sa  
The r  
been t  
of diss  
paroch  
serve,  
admira  
format

When the preachers taught their flocks to obey Cæsar in all temporal concerns, 'Cæsar' had actually come to mean Christ's Bishop ! The Bishop, as a temporal sovereign, was 'the State,' while the synod of Protestant pastors was 'the Church.' Until the time of Bishop Blarer, who promoted the fierce counter-reformation in the parishes of the Jura, the prelates who ruled over the prince-bishopric, in a true Renaissance temper, amiably reconciled themselves to this extraordinary condition of things. The parishes were 'Evangelical,' and elected their preachers without any reference to the Bishop as a spiritual ruler, or any interference on his part. He simply 'confirmed' the elected, like any other secular ruler, in the legal possession of the prebend or endowment. Bishop Melchior of Lichtenfels, the mild prince who reigned over the see from 1554 to 1575, enjoyed the warm affection and confidence of his Protestant subjects. So in East Switzerland, for half a century, Protestant pastors were nominated in many of the parishes by the Bishop of Constance, and even by abbots, priors, and abbesses of Catholic convents, who still maintained their inherited rights of patronage. An essay by Hermann Kasser, Pfarrer of Hutwyl, gives an instructive account of the 'counter-reformation' carried on by Bishop Blarer in 1575-1680. Paul Flückiger, Pfarrer of Niederbipp, brings out a mass of new material in a paper on Zwingli's relations to Bern. An article by Max Billeter, Pfarrer of Boltigen, on the Synod of Bern in 1532 is crowded with interesting details on the condition of a people still hesitating between the old and the new. The fact which comes out clearly to the scientific and tolerant student of the materials is that here, as elsewhere in Christendom, the Christian people wanted to get rid of Papalism, but did not want to get rid of Catholicism. These two things, which were not merely different, as Professor Nippold insists, but which are now perceived by a true critical historian to have been fundamentally contrary, were confounded. The editor's preface and his judicial summing up are remarkable signs of the times. He points to the Old Catholic movement of our day as the restoration of the very ideal which floated before the minds of the best reformers, but which they were prevented from realizing by the pressure of the times thrusting them into positions where they never intended to stand. Dr. Nippold has added a remarkable lecture of his own, delivered at Bern to the Catholic and Protestant students in common on 'Das Leben Jesu im Mittelalter.' The true father of such 'Lives of Christ,' he points out, like the true 'beginner of Teutonic Church history,' was an Englishman ; the one Cædmon, the other Bæda. All who have used the wonderful *Vita Christi* of Ludolf the Saxon will agree in the glowing praise which Nippold gives to it. The richly illustrated lecture (to judge from its length it must have been three or four lectures) deserves a translator. How a 'dissidence of dissent,' a sectarianism which broke up that unity of national and parochial churches which Zwingli and Œcolampadius strove to preserve, was everywhere developed where the larger unity was lost, is admirably drawn in 'The Swiss Anabaptism at the period of the Reformation,' by Gottfried Strasser, the scholarly Pfarrer of Grindelwald.

*Theologische Literaturzeitung* for 1884. Nos. 14-26, July to December. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.)

WHEN Tennyson wrote his well-known hendecasyllabic line, 'Irresponsible indolent reviewers!' he could not have had in mind such men as are on the staff of the periodical before us. 'Irresponsible' they are not, for they always sign their names at the end of their criticisms; and 'indolent' they are not, for they give careful descriptions of the works reviewed, and go thoroughly into details, in such a way as to make their articles very practical, and really helpful to the theological student. In the thirteen numbers now under review are contained 110 articles, by exactly fifty different scholars, besides the fortnightly bibliographical lists (of new books, magazine articles, and criticisms—all theological, but not all German) which form an especially valuable feature of this periodical. All its English readers must have been sorry to see (col. 637) that Dr. C. R. Gregory, who has made many friends in this country as well as in his native America and his adopted German home, has been compelled to resign into other hands the duty of contributing these lists, although we may rejoice that he will now be more at liberty to prosecute in the various European libraries those researches which are necessary for the completion of his *Prolegomena to Tischendorf's Greek Testament*. Dr. J. Müller, Imperial Librarian at Berlin, is his successor. The two editors have written more reviews than any of the other contributors. Dr. A. Harnack takes credit for seven, principally on ecclesiastical history; Dr. Schürer's name is subscribed to six, all relating to Biblical studies. But the writer who occupies most space is F. Loofs, of Leipzig, in one long article (printed in four portions) dealing with vols. ii.-iv. of Cardinal Pitra's *Analecta Sacra* (Paris: Roger), which contain some important contributions to ante-Nicene literature, especially the works of Melito, Euthérius, Origen, Gregory Thaum., Methodius, and Alexander of Alexandria; but clearly what the reviewer says (455) of one portion is true of the whole—'Much (in spite of the title) is not new; of the new, the more interesting is uncertain, and the comparatively certain is uninteresting.' Next in length comes Gottschick's article on vol. i. of the second edition of Pfeiderer's *Religionsphilosophie* (Berlin: Reimer), which passes under review the history of the philosophy of religion from Spinoza to the present time. To the same able writer we also owe a penetrating criticism of Jacoby's *Allgemeine Pädagogik* (Gotha: Perthes), an excellent work on an engrossing subject. Prof. Mangold has published a second work on the *Epistle to the Romans* (Marburg: Elwert), in which he once more defends at great length Baur's view that the primitive Christian community at Rome was mainly composed of Jewish converts: Schürer ably criticizes the book and champions the rival view of Weizsäcker. Weiss rather scornfully condemns Bleibtreu's *Exposition of Rom. I.-III.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck) as an example of the lamentable results to which Hofmann's suggestions and Hofmann's perverse exegetical method may lead a too dependent pupil. The same Exposition is incidentally described as 'bewildered and bewildering' by Jülicher in his laudatory notice of Grafe's

broch  
which  
the  
ô vop  
Flesh  
Wen  
reade  
those  
im A  
viol  
concl  
interp  
the c  
speci  
his p  
Luthe  
contai  
Bible  
Achel  
The i  
No. I.  
hardt  
compe  
Grego  
Martin  
Nestle  
the lib  
time;  
Tische  
the son  
Böhl,  
correct  
(posthu  
bracing  
shows a  
four hu  
a host  
these a  
the mo  
Meyer)  
Kölling  
by Har  
Life of  
ginning  
tion, an  
in full p  
formed  
Bessarab  
Delitzsch  
Krauss'



brochure on *The Pauline Doctrine of the Law* (Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr), which seems to contain a really helpful contribution towards settling the vexed question as to the identity or distinction of νόμος and ὁ νόμος. Dr. Dickson's Baird Lecture on *S. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit* (Glasgow: Maclehose) is complacently recognized by Wendt as a commendatory representation, for the benefit of English readers, of his (Wendt's) own views on the subject in preference to those of all other modern German writers. Klostermann's *Probleme im Aposteltexte* (Gotha: Perthes) is shown by Sieffert to be a series of violent distortions of passages in the Acts and Pauline Epistles: a conclusive refutation of the author's singular opinion that philological interpretations by a scholar untrained in theology are preferable to the commentaries of a professional exegete. A yet more wretched specimen of the absurdities a man may write when he goes outside his proper sphere is the physician Küchenmeister's monograph on Luther's hymn *Ein' feste Burg* (Dresden: Pierson). *Inter alia* it contains a list of the sources of the hymn, beginning with the Hebrew Bible and ending with a book published in A.D. 1877! Well does Achelis (437) remind him of the proverb '*ne sutor supra crepidam.*' The introduction to Prof. Wordsworth's *Old Latin Biblical Texts, No. I.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press) is held up to admiration by Gebhardt as a model of what such things ought to be; and the same competent reviewer has sympathetically criticized the first part of Gregory's *Prolegomena to Tischendorf* (Leipzig: Hinrichs). The Abbé Martin's *Description Technique* (Paris: Maissonneuve) is eulogized by Nestle as a very full account of 369 MSS. of the N. T. preserved in the libraries of Paris, seventy-five being therein described for the first time; from it we learn that folio 138 of C (Ephræmi), of which Tischendorf gave a facsimile, is now missing. Rade severely handles the somewhat heterodox work on *The Incarnation* (Vienna: Faesy) by Böhl, who seems to think that the doctrine has never before been correctly explained. K. Müller summarizes vol. ii. of Nitzsch's (posthumous) *History of the German People* (Leipzig: Duncker), embracing the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in a charming essay which shows a complete mastery both of details and of principles. The four hundredth anniversary of Zwingli's birthday called forth last year a host of pamphlets on his life and work and relation to Luther: these are characterized in a long article by Staehelin; to us perhaps the most interesting would be Finsler's *Ulrich Zwingli* (Zürich: Meyer), of which 63,000 copies were sold within a few months. Kölling's *History of Arianism* (Gutersloh: Bertelsmann) is pronounced by Harnack to be prejudiced, uncritical, and feeble; whereas Förster's *Life of S. Ambrose* (Halle a. S.: Strien) is declared good in its beginning, better in the middle, and better still in its concluding portion, and all the more admirable because its author is a clergyman in full pastoral work. Very interesting information on the recently-formed Judæo-Christian community under Joseph Rabinowitz in Bessarabia (S. Russia) is given in Harnack's review of Franz Delitzsch's *Documente* (Erlangen: Deichert). Achelis highly praises Krauss's work on *Homiletics* (Gotha: Perthes), and rightly rebukes

the ignorant irreverence of *Letters from Heaven* (Bremen: Müller), the author of which he believes to be a German lady that has lived under English influences and been chiefly engaged in teaching little girls. Among the 127 books that are reviewed in the papers before us there are only seven written in English, and of these only *one* was published in England; yet we think that in a much larger proportion of instances our theological publishers might do well to send copies of new books to the 'Redaction' of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

#### NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS, &c.

MR. THEODORE WIRGMAN'S *Prayer Book, with Scripture Proofs and Historical Notes* (London: Bemrose), has most deservedly reached a third edition. It is a most valuable treatise, and has been carefully revised, and in parts rewritten. We strongly recommend it as a school-prize book.

Dr. Cheyne's *Prophecies of Isaiah* (Kegan Paul and Co.) has already been reviewed in these pages, and we need do no more than call attention to the appearance of the third edition, the call for which is a pleasing evidence that the value of the book is widely recognized. It has been revised throughout; account is taken of works which have appeared in the interval since the last edition; and one new essay, on 'The Suffering Messiah,' has been substituted for that on 'The Royal Messiah in Genesis.'

*Disestablishment and Disendowment: what are they?* (Macmillan), by Professor E. A. Freeman, appears most opportunely in a second edition. It should be read by all who wish to understand the rights of the questions raised by the Liberationists.

Too great circulation could not be given to the pamphlet entitled *Is there a God? considered* (Stanford), written by a Cambridge professor for distribution among working men who are exposed to the teaching of the Secularist societies. Equally good, for another class, is Mr. R. C. Moberley's *Light of the Revelation of God upon the Question of Marriage with a Sister-in-Law* (Chester: Phillipson).

A sermon by the Rev. J. H. Thomas, preached at Fulham on the day after the funeral of the late Bishop of London, has been published at the request of the Bishop's family.

*Vaticanism as seen from the Banks of the Tiber* (London: Bosworth), by S. I. M., with a preface by Dean Plumptre, is an abstract of Curci's *Vaticano Regio*, which will be useful to those who have no access to the original work.

The second volume of Mr. Leslie Stephen's *Dictionary of National Biography* (Smith, Elder, and Co.), comprising the names from Annesley to Baird, has made its welcome appearance. The articles are of unequal merit, and often disproportionate in length to the claims of the subject. But it is a very useful work. Prebendary Stephens has given an excellent life of S. Anselm, and Canon Overton, a most competent authority, undertakes such Anglican worthies of the past as Atterbury and Mrs. Astell (who endeavoured, in 1694, to found a religious house for women), with some who belong to the present generation, such as Bishop Armstrong and Canon Ashwell, a former editor of the *Church Quarterly Review*.